

LEGAL & GENERAL

LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

ESTABLISHED 1836.

THE
PERFECTED SYSTEM
OF
LIFE
ASSURANCE.

Total Funds - - **£9,000,000.**
Income, 1912 - - **£1,185,000.**

TRUSTEES.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY.
THE HON. MR. JUSTICE DEANE.
ROMER WILLIAMS, Esq., D.L., J.P.
CHAR. P. JOHNSON, Esq., J.P.
ROBERT YOUNGER, Esq., K.C.

DIRECTORS.

<p>Chairman. ROMER WILLIAMS, Esq., D.L., J.P. Buckmaster, S. O., Esq., K.C., M.P. Chadwick-Healey, Sir Charles E. H., K.C.B., K.C. Channell, The Hon. Mr. Justice. Deane, The Hon. Mr. Justice. Farmer, Henry L., Esq. Finch, Arthur J., Esq., J.P. Follett, John S., Esq., J.P.</p>	<p>Deputy-Chairman. CHARLES P. JOHNSON, Esq., J.P. Frere, John W. C., Esq. Haldane, Francis G., Esq., W.S. Pattinson, Walter B., Esq. Rawlin, Thomas, Esq. Rider, J. E. W., Esq. Saltwell, Wm. Henry, Esq. Tweddle, E. W., Esq. Younger, Robert, Esq., K.C.</p>
---	--

BONUS RECORD.

1891	-	-	36/-	%	per annum, compound.
1896	-	-	38/-	%	" " "
1901	-	-	38/-	%	" " "
1906	-	-	38/-	%	" " "
1911	-	-	38/-	%	" " "

**WHOLE LIFE ASSURANCE AT MINIMUM COST UNDER
THE SOCIETY'S PERFECTED MAXIMUM TABLE.**

**ALL CLASSES OF LIFE ASSURANCE AND
ANNUITIES GRANTED.**

ESTATE DUTIES.

Policies are granted at specially low rates for Non-Profit Assurances, and these are particularly advantageous for the purpose of providing Death Duties and portions for younger children.

LOANS.

These are granted in large or small amounts on Reversionary Interests of all kinds and other approved Securities, and transactions will be completed with a minimum of delay.

HEAD OFFICE: 10, FLEET ST., LONDON, E.C.

The Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter.

(ESTABLISHED IN 1857.)

LONDON, OCTOBER 11, 1913.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION, WHICH MUST BE PAID IN ADVANCE:

£1 6s.; by Post, £1 8s.; Foreign, £1 10s. 4d.
HALF-YEARLY AND QUARTERLY SUBSCRIPTIONS IN PROPORTION.

* * The Editor cannot undertake to return rejected contributions, and copies should be kept of all articles sent by writers who are not on the regular staff of the JOURNAL.

All letters intended for publication must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

GENERAL HEADINGS.

CURRENT TOPICS.....	815	LEGAL NEWS.....	810
THE REAL PROPERTY AND CONVEY- ANCING BILLS.....	818	COURT PAPERS.....	820
REVIEWS.....	819	WINDING-UP NOTICES.....	826
NEW ORDERS, &c.....	819	CREDITORS' NOTICES.....	827
LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL.....	819	BANKRUPTCY NOTICES.....	828
		PUBLIC GENERAL STATUTES.....	

Current Topics.

The Legal Vacations.

IT IS stated that the King's Bench Commission are about to recommend some important changes in the arrangement of the legal year. The courts are just about to re-open in the middle of October, and it is a fitting time to observe that they might very well have been at work a fortnight ago. The shortening of the Long Vacation to this extent has frequently been urged, and the proposal, it seems, is to be indorsed by the commission. If the information is correct, Mr. Justice DARLING and his colleagues will recommend that the vacation shall end on the 1st of October instead of the 12th of October. Then there comes the question of the shorter vacations, Christmas, Easter and Whitsuntide. The Christmas vacation is fortunately fixed, and is not of such a length as to call for interference. Easter and Whitsuntide are marred by the fact that their dates depend on ecclesiastical customs and are variable. Everyone realized the inconvenience of this last year, when Easter was unusually early, and we had got over Whitsuntide too before we were well through the rigours of an English spring. The commission, it seems, propose the fixing of the Easter vacation so as to commence on the third Monday in April, and the abolition of the Whitsuntide recess. A holiday on the second Monday in June is to be thrown in as a consolation. This arrangement will save time, but we fancy that many persons would sooner lose the Easter than the Whitsuntide recess; and the odd Monday, if it is to be given, should surely coincide with the Whitsuntide bank holiday.

The Appeal Cause Lists.

THE MICHAELMAS cause lists contain 363 appeals, of which eighty-four are from the Chancery Division, four from Lancashire, and 228 from the King's Bench Division. Admiralty furnishes nineteen and Bankruptcy two appeals, and there are twenty-six Workmen's Compensation appeals. A year ago the total number of appeals was 239, and at the commencement of last sittings it was 267, so that there is a very large increase in the business awaiting the court—an increase which, it would seem, can only be satisfactorily dealt with if the court sits in three divisions. The lists include appeals in *Bebb v. Law Society*, against the decision of JOYCE, J., refusing to recognize Miss BEBB'S right to be admitted to the Preliminary Examination; in *Hewson v. Shelley*, against the decision of ASTBURY, J., depriving a purchaser of his land in consequence of the discovery of a missing will; in *Watney, Combe, Reid, & Co. v. Berners*, on the incidence, under section 2 of the Finance Act, 1912, of the increase in licence duties on free houses under the Finance Act, 1910; and in *Forbes v. Samuel* on the recovery of penalties against a member of Parliament.

The High Court Cause Lists.

THE CHANCERY DIVISION lists show a total of 368, and in addition there are fifty-eight company matters. A year ago these figures were 376 and sixty respectively, and at the beginning of last sittings 257 and forty-seven. Thus the business, though successfully attacked in the course of the year, has risen again to the level of last Michaelmas. The King's Bench Division lists contain a total of 841 cases, of which 316 are before the Divisional Court, 510 are actions for trial—319 with juries and 191 without—and fifteen are bankruptcy cases. It is interesting to note the variation in the figures during the last three years. At Michaelmas, 1910, the total in the King's Bench Division was 1,120; in 1911 it was 740; in 1912 it was 966; and now, as just stated, 841. The present number of actions for trial—510—compares with 659 a year ago. Here there is a substantial diminution, but the revenue paper with its 131 cases represents business which has, we believe, been waiting for many months. While the state of the division is not so bad as it has been, it would be premature to conclude that the arrangements for the conduct of business are in a satisfactory state. The Probate, &c., Division has 550 causes, as against 622 a year ago, and 460 at the beginning of last sittings.

Conflicts of Jurisdiction.

IN A previous issue (p. 780, *ante*) we pointed out that there appears to be an excessive duplication of inquiries into certain classes of cases under our present system of criminal jurisprudence. Our point is aptly illustrated by the disagreement between magistrates and coroner's jury which has taken place in the case of *Re v. Herbert James Everett*, which came before the Epsom bench of justices on the 8th of October. EVERETT was driving a motor-car which came into collision at Banstead Downs with a lady's cycle, and killed her under circumstances which we may not comment upon, since the case is still *sub judice*. The coroner's jury, at the resulting inquest on the dead woman, found EVERETT guilty of manslaughter, and persisted in their verdict, notwithstanding the opinion of the coroner to the contrary; thereupon, he was committed for trial to Guildford Assizes on the jury's inquisition. Next came the usual preliminary investigation before the justices, who held that there was not a *prima facie* case of manslaughter, and dismissed the charge. But this does not dispose of the case. The coroner's inquisition, like the true bill of a grand jury, remains in force, and must come before a petty jury to be disposed of by them. Whether the magistrates dismiss the case at their preliminary investigation, or the grand jury refuse to find a true bill on indictment, that inquisition—an independent proceeding—must still be disposed of. In practice, it is customary for prosecuting counsel, at the trial, to accept a plea of not guilty and offer no evidence against the prisoner, whereupon the jury are directed to acquit him. Of course, it is also possible for the Attorney-General to enter a *Nolle prosequi*. But in the absence of one or other of these courses a trial must take place.

Problems of Punishment.

THE PRISON Commissioners' Report for last year has now been issued, and contains, as it usually does, much interesting and suggestive matter. There were 9,726 fewer persons received into prison for criminal offences last year than in the year before, and for the last ten years there has been a steady movement in the same direction. Indeed, since 1903-4 there has been a fall of 38,924 in the annual figure. Two different sets of causes account for this change. One is purely temporary and accidental, namely the boom of trade. We doubt whether it accounts for the decrease to so great an extent as the Commissioners apparently consider, for after all it is not the respectable artisan out of employment who swells our criminal class. The other group of causes is of a permanent nature, and, in our opinion, is the more effective of the two. We refer to the gradual growth of enlightened views as to punishment upon the part of all concerned in the administration of the law, and in particular to the growing reluctance of judges to send a first offender to prison unless his crime is of a grave moral character. The probation system instituted in 1907, the constant attempts of the Home

Office to impress upon magistrates that respectable prisoners sentenced to pay fines should be given time to find the money by instalments, and the efforts of the Court of Criminal Appeal to discourage unduly heavy sentences for trivial offences, have all had their share in bringing about the result. The governors of Durham, Northallerton, and Exeter prisons comment upon the effect which those causes have had in bringing about the happy decline in criminal statistics. But unfortunately not all judges and magistrates are equally enlightened; there is a gradation of humane sentiment and social insight on the bench as elsewhere; the difference between the conduct of judges who lead the van and those who lag in the rear is very marked indeed. To secure some greater uniformity it would seem that legislation is necessary, and the Prison Commissioners hint that such legislation has long been overdue. Happily, the Home Secretary, as appears from a recent speech in the provinces, is alive to the duty which in successive annual reports the Commissioners have urged upon him, and has promised that Parliament shall have an opportunity to consider the question next year.

Imprisonment for Debt.

NOW, IT so happens that criminal offenders are by no means the only persons sent to prison in England. The County Court Returns, which appeared some weeks ago, show that a large number of persons are sent to prison every year in default of paying sums recovered against them in the county courts. Column 10 of Table II. *b* in those returns sets out the number of debtors arrested under orders of commitment in each circuit and court; columns 17, 18, and 19 divide those debtors into three classes—those who pay on arrest or before imprisonment, those who succeed in making payment before the conclusion of their term, and those who serve the full period. From this we find that last year 142,457 warrants of commitment were issued, but that only 5,820 persons actually underwent imprisonment for the whole or a part of their term. The moral would certainly seem to be that warrants of commitment are necessary in practice for the purpose of inducing small debtors to pay. Even if it is considered, as is no doubt the case, that a very large number of the 136,000 who pay after commitment are assisted by relatives or friends and have not themselves the means to pay, it still remains the fact that most of them must have possessed some means, but wilfully refused to employ them in the liquidations of their debts. If there did not exist this summary mode of securing payment, in the case of poor people who live in lodgings or furnish their homes on the hire-purchase system, they might not be able to obtain credit for necessities in their time of distress. But while this consideration may reasonably and strongly be urged in favour of the present system, there is a good deal to be said on the other side. As a matter of fact, in the opinion of many observers, working men do not, as a rule, go to prison for non-payment of debts for necessities. Such debts in time of full employment are liquidated out of the week's earnings on pay-day, and if the score runs up in bad times, respectable men pay gratefully in times of returning prosperity the shopkeeper who has trusted them in their dark hour. It is the tallyman's credit which usually leads its victims to the debtor's prison. These tallymen, especially in the North of England, canvass from door to door, and induce the wives of working men to purchase unnecessary articles. The unfortunate husband often never hears of the purchase until a judgment summons is issued against him, since personal service of a plaintiff is not required in the county court; and when the bailiff serves the summons at the defendant's residence, his wife too often thinks it best to conceal it. To enforce payment of such debts by the process of imprisonment is simply to enforce a vicious system of pushing those trades which minister to luxury, not necessity.

Railway Return Tickets.

A CASE of very great importance to holiday-makers, which, if there are not technical difficulties in the way, appears likely to be carried to a higher court, came up before the City of London Court a week ago in *Herman Cohen v. London Brighton and South Coast Railway Co.* (September 30th). The actual sum at stake was only one shilling and fivepence, but

the principle was a large one. How far is a passenger bound by conditions printed on a ticket he has never read, and to which his attention was not called when or before he paid his fare at the booking office? We deliberately refrain from using the common expression "when he purchased his ticket," because the word "purchase" gives a wholly misleading idea as to the nature of the transaction in its legal aspect. A railway ticket is not a contract, as that expression rather suggests; it is simply a receipt for money paid in respect of a contract offered by the company when it starts its undertaking and verbally accepted by the passenger either (1) when he asks for a ticket, or (2) when he enters the train without a ticket (*per* Lords CHELMSFORD and HATHERLEY in *Henderson v. Stevenson*, 1875, L. R. 2 H. L. (Sc) 470). Hence, it seems to follow that the terms and conditions of the contract must be gathered quite independently of the ticket, subject to one qualification with which we shall deal presently. Now, in the case we are discussing, the point came up in this way. The plaintiff asked on Friday for a "week-end ticket" to Brighton; he was given a ticket, which contained on the face of it in very small print—so small that the trial judge said he could not read it—a condition limiting the user of the return half to Sundays, Mondays, Tuesdays. The plaintiff, in fact, came back on Saturday night; he was refused admission to the starting platform until he paid excess fare, i.e., the difference between the week-end ticket price and that of two single tickets. He paid under protest, and then sued in the county court to recover the sum paid. The case was tried by consent before the Assistant Registrar, who found in the plaintiff's favour, partly on legal grounds, but partly also on the question of fact that the actual notice given the passenger of the conditions was insufficient; for, although the validity of such conditions is a question of law (*Henderson v. Stevenson*, *supra*), the sufficiency of the notice given of the conditions is a question of fact for the jury or other judge of fact: *Richardson v. Rowntree* (1894, A. C. 217).

Validity of Conditions on Tickets.

NOW UPON these simple facts quite a number of complex points arise, not a single one of which is easy to answer; indeed, the authorities upon this branch of law are few in number, and extremely confusing. In the first place, we have to consider whether, in the case of such a contract as that we are discussing, any conditions at all can be imposed on the passenger by the simple process of printing them on his ticket. Surely, we are tempted to say, he does not assent to such conditions at all, and therefore they are no part of his contract. But such a view, it has been held, is erroneous. For the offer of the railway company is an offer to carry passengers upon the terms contained in its time-tables and regulations. So, if the passenger accepts that offer, he must agree to be bound by those terms, whether or not he informs himself of them (*per* STEPHEN, J., in *Watkins v. Rymill*, 10 Q. B. D. 178). But then, are we to say that the passenger is bound by every condition the company may choose to put in its time-tables? The answer is "No." There are three limitations to this doctrine. In the first place, since a railway company is bound by statute to carry passengers and goods, the conditions it attaches to its statutory contracts must be reasonable. As a general rule, in order that such conditions may be binding, the carrier must offer two alternatives to the passenger—one of accepting *without any conditions* at the maximum rate allowed by law; the other at a lower rate, but subject to the conditions complained of: *Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Railway Co. v. Brown* (1883, 8 A. C. 703). This point is settled in the present case by the fact that the traveller took a special week-end ticket at a lower rate; he could have taken two single tickets at the higher rate if he had so chosen. The second limitation is this: the condition must not be repugnant to the main object of the contract. This is a general principle of our common law applicable everywhere. Now, here it may be argued, and, in fact, was argued, that non-availability for return on Saturday is inconsistent with the very idea of a week-end ticket. But we do not ourselves see this. A week-end ticket does not mean one available for return during a period known as a week-end, but one available for going at the end of the week, and returning at the beginning of the next week—at least, that

is the way in which the term strikes us. The third limitation is the one already discussed, namely, that proper notice of the condition must be given to passengers. Its mere existence in a time table is not enough; it must be printed on the face of the ticket or referred to unmistakably upon that face: *Henderson v. Stevenson* (*supra*) and *Parker v. South-Eastern Railway Co.* (2 C. P. D. 416). But that was admittedly done in the present case, except for the judge's suggestion that he could not read the print because of its smallness; and therefore we should not be surprised to see his decision reversed.

Taxation of Foreign Income.

THE LEARNED editor of DOWELL'S Income Tax Acts, in a note on page 235 of the Seventh Edition, says that Schedule D. is the most productive schedule of the Income Tax. It certainly is the one out of which arise most of the disputed points which come before the courts, and the recent case of *Liverpool and London and Globe Insurance Co. v. Bennett* (*Surveyor of Taxes*) (*ante*, p. 739) is not an exception to this rule. An English insurance company doing business in the United States, Canada and Australia was compelled by the local laws of those countries to invest within their borders certain sums of money by way of security to local policy-holders. The company did not receive in the United Kingdom the interest or dividends on these compulsory foreign investments. The question was whether they were part of its taxable income for the purposes of the Income Tax Acts. Now the taxation of profits and gains, of course, falls within Schedule D., as provided by section 100 of the Income Tax Act, 1842. The original schedule under that statute has been repealed; the one now in force is that enacted by the Income Tax Act, 1853, s. 2, schedule (D.). So far as relevant it is as follows:—"For and in respect of the annual profits or gains arising or accruing to any person residing in the United Kingdom from any kind of property whatever, whether situated in the United Kingdom or elsewhere, and for and in respect of the annual profits or gains arising or accruing to any person residing in the United Kingdom or elsewhere," etc. It is clear that a registered English insurance company is a "person residing in the United Kingdom." But the dividends and interest on the foreign investments, in order to be taxable, must not merely belong to a person resident in the United Kingdom; they must be received by that person "for and in respect of his annual profits or gains." Now the insurance company contended that the interest on those compulsory foreign investments was not profits or gains in their business at all; the investments were of no use in their business, and stood altogether outside of it. If this view were correct, then, since the income was not actually received in or remitted to the United Kingdom, it would not come within the scope of our Income Tax Acts at all: *Gresham Life Assurance Society v. Bishop* (1902, A. C. 287). But the Revenue judge, the Court of Appeal, and the House of Lords have all agreed in taking the view that the interest on these foreign investments must be taken into consideration in finding the balance of the company's profits or gains as an insurance company, and therefore is "profits or gains" within the meaning of the statute, so as to be taxable. This result, indeed, seems necessarily to follow from the fact that the insurance company earns profits in respect of its American and Australian business, which it could not carry on at all unless it complied with the local laws rendering certain investments compulsory. The making of such investments is therefore a necessary part of the Company's business, and the income derived from them would likewise seem to be a part of its business "profits or gains."

Mr. Robert Wallace, K.C., in his address to the Grand Jury at the London Sessions on the 7th inst., said that the calendar continued to show a decrease of crime in the county. The report of the Prison Commissioners just issued showed that this satisfactory state of affairs was practically universal throughout the country. The new methods of dealing with accused persons, of helping them instead of turning them into confirmed criminals, as the old system often did, and keeping them out of prison by dealing with them under the Probation Act and providing them with opportunities for keeping honest, had had most marvellous results. That was a matter for rejoicing to every one who had the welfare of the country at heart.

The Real Property and Conveyancing Bills.

XI.

THE PROPOSALS FOR SIMPLIFYING PRIVATE CONVEYANCING (Continued).

Exceptions and Reservations.—The Bill proposes to confer on the proprietor extensive power of dealing with the proprietary estate—that is, the fee simple or term of years—which is vested in him; but his disposition will be subject to paramount interests (*ante*, p. 770). The draftsman has ingeniously made use of this fact in order to preserve various estates which it is not proposed to place at the mercy of the proprietor. These are enumerated in the list of exceptions and reservations contained in clause 32, and the clause is made effectual by clause 2 (3) (v), which includes as paramount interests “all powers, rights, and interests excepted or reserved out of the operation of this part of this Act, or created under any power so excepted or reserved.” It is obvious, therefore, that the efficacy of the new system as regards purchasers depends very much on what these excepted matters are, and we should imagine that clause 32 has been one of the most difficult in the Bill to draft. It cannot have been easy to select out of the complex mass of possible rights in land, those which require to be protected against the proprietor.

Clause 32 is not, however, limited to rights requiring protection against the proprietor, but also preserves powers and interests which might be thought to be prejudiced by the new system. Thus it preserves the following matters: powers over estates arising under existing statutes, settlements, or wills (sub-clause 1); the jurisdiction to rectify or set aside deeds in cases of fraud or mistake (sub-clause 6); the special provisions as to disposition contained in particular statutes, such as the Benefices Act, 1898 (sub-clause 9); the protection of the Middlesex and Yorkshire Registries, though this is confined to dispositions of a proprietary estate (sub-clause 10); and the necessity in special cases of obtaining official consents, such as the consent of the Charity Commissioners to the sale of charity land (sub-clause 11). And the Bill does not authorize new forms of assurance (sub-clause 2), or alter the law of merger (sub-clause 8).

The cases where the clause creates, or allows the creation of, paramount interests seem to be contained in sub-clauses 3, 5, and 7. Sub-clause 3 preserves existing charges and interests. Sub-clause 5 preserves the power of persons other than the proprietor to create leases and accept surrenders: thus a lease by a mortgagor under the Conveyancing Acts will be paramount to the estate of the mortgagee: and sub-clause 7 preserves estates acquired by adverse possession. In addition, sub-clause 4 preserves liens by deposit, and makes the lien paramount, though at the same time subjecting it to cautions and inhibitions existing when it arose. Thus a purchaser would take subject to the lien, but the deposittee cannot, by omitting to clear off cautions, obtain any priority over the cautioners.

With regard to the clause as a whole, it is essential for carrying out the scheme of the Bill consistently with existing interests, and with interests which may arise hereafter, and which ought to override the proprietary estate; and it shows marks of extreme care in its preparation. But perhaps its arrangement might be improved so as to distinguish provisions under which paramount interests are to be created or arise—such as sub-clauses 5 and 7—from those, such as sub-clauses 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 11, which merely safeguard existing rights or requirements. And we should suggest reconsideration of the very wide term of sub-clause 1. If powers under all existing instruments can override proprietary estates, will not this indefinitely postpone the time when the new system will become really operative? Probably, however, the provision goes no further than is necessary. We notice in one of the specimen abstracts in the first Schedule that this provision is treated as keeping alive the power to convey by deed poll under the Lands Clauses Act.

Cautions and Inhibitions.—Cautions are an essential feature of the scheme. In the case of settlements the subordinate interests will, as we have seen, be protected by the appointment of Settled

Land Act trustees (*ante*, pp. 800, 808). In other cases subordinate interests will be at the mercy of the proprietor unless they are protected by cautions. This change has to be considered from the point of view of purchasers and of persons having equitable interests. To purchasers no doubt it will be a great advantage. At present the abstract must, speaking generally, shew all equitable interests except such as can be overreached by the vendor; it need not, for instance, when a mortgagee is selling, shew dealings with the equity of redemption; and the purchaser is bound to have regard, not only to equitable interests so shewn, but also to equitable interests not appearing on the abstract, of which he may have notice either actual or constructive. The Bill does not abolish the doctrine of notice, and, indeed, it defines “notice” as including, with reference to a purchaser, “actual as well as constructive notice” (clause 39 (12)), though surely this should read “constructive as well as actual.” Thus, notice of a restrictive covenant makes it a paramount interest (clause 2 (3) (vi)). But the Bill enormously reduces the scope of the doctrine, and in general notice of a subordinate estate or interest will not affect a purchaser. In this respect the purchaser of land who gets the proprietary estate will be in the same position as a purchaser of a ship who gets on the register of shipping, or a purchaser of registered land who gets on the land register. Moreover, if the purchaser finds that a caution has been lodged, he is not directly concerned with the cautioner. He will, under the provision referred to subsequently, require the vendor to have the caution withdrawn.

As regards equitable owners, the change operates in two ways. At present an equitable owner is not bound to take any steps to protect himself. If his interest is known to the purchaser, that is enough. The purchaser must require it to be satisfied or he will take subject to it. On the other hand, the equitable owner cannot be sure that his interest will be disclosed to the purchaser. If the legal owner succeeds in concealing it, the equitable owner is excluded. And a legal owner who desires to oust an equitable interest can usually do so unless that interest carries possession of the title deeds. The scheme alters this condition of things by depriving the equitable interest of its efficacy as an equity—an efficacy which, as we have seen, is only precarious, and is likely to fail just where the owner requires protection—and by enabling the owner to give it real efficacy by lodging a caution.

We have spoken of “real efficacy,” but it may be thought that this begs the question. Is a system of caution really efficacious? For this purpose we must notice shortly what the proposed system is. It is defined by clauses 33 to 38 and by the provisions of the third Schedule. The register of cautions and inhibitions will be kept by the Land Registrar (clause 33). While a caution or inhibition remains in force against land, a disposition of the proprietary estate will only take effect subject to the interests of the cautioner or inhibitor (clause 35). But the caution does not do more than protect the equity as it exists; it does not affect priorities (clause 36); in other words, it does not operate, like notice of an assignment of an equitable interest in personal estate, or like registration of a deed in Yorkshire, to give priority over the earlier unprotected interests, though, of course, in the event of a sale, it will be satisfied while the unprotected interest may be lost. And vendors will be bound, notwithstanding any contract to the contrary, to procure all cautions and inhibitions to be vacated and to produce an official certificate of search—which will be a document of title—that the land is clear (clause 38). The third Schedule fills up the details of this scheme. The caution will always be against a named person, and except where a general caution is allowed—as in respect of death duties or in anticipation of bankruptcy—it will identify the land (paragraph 2 (1)). On an intended disposition by the proprietor, the cautioner will be entitled to 14 days’ notice, and if he takes no further steps, then, at the end of that time, the caution will drop (paragraph 3). But if his claim is not satisfied, he can make the restriction permanent by applying to the court for an inhibition (paragraph 6). Thus the cautioner has, it seems, full opportunity for making the protection effectual. To provide against the notice of disposition failing to reach him or being

disregarded, he may give four names, one of which may be the name of a firm, to which notices are to be sent (paragraph 2 (1)). Thus he may require notice to be sent to his solicitors as well as to himself. On the other hand, if he lodges a caution without reasonable cause, he will be liable to pay compensation for any injury sustained (paragraph 2 (4)).

It can hardly be doubted that this system will be advantageous both to purchasers and to persons with equitable interests who choose to take care of themselves. Of course, there will be many who will not lodge a caution, and in general no harm will result. But occasionally a careless or complaisant claimant will suffer loss. It is the same, however, with systems of registration. Equitable owners must protect themselves by adopting the prescribed means, or must be at the mercy of the registered proprietor. In this respect the proposed system gives subordinate interests the same advantages as under registration, while, as also under registration, their owners will neglect the proper precaution at their own risk. There will be some slight expense in lodging and clearing cautions, and occasionally there will be law suits arising out of cautions. But these will hardly be so burdensome as the numerous suits brought in the past to protect or to exclude equitable interests. The new system, in this respect, will help the purchaser, and it will help the diligent owner of an equitable interest. Any expense it causes will, we imagine, be slight compared with the expense and trouble it saves.

It should be noticed also that the search of the register of cautions and inhibitions will avoid all or most of the searches hitherto customary. Apparently there will be no need to search for writs and orders affecting land, *lis pendens*, annuities and bankruptcies. But whether this statement is strictly correct or not, the practice in respect of searches should be greatly simplified.

Abstracts of Title.—One of the chief objects of the proposed system is to shorten abstracts. Specimen epitomes of abstracts are given in the first Schedule. These are in the present full form, and distinguish by italics those parts which will require to be retained. Clause 31 provides that abstracts may be framed on the principles thus indicated. It will be readily understood, from the account we have given of the scheme, that much which is now contained in abstracts will be omitted, and the method adopted by the draftsman shews this very graphically. Of course, in many cases abstracts are short at the present time; where, for instance, the property has for many years been clear of settlements. On the other hand, in cases where settlements intervene the abstracts become long and complicated. Under the new system a large portion—to judge by the examples given, at least half—of the matters now included will be unnecessary, and the abstract will consist only of conveyances and devises of the proprietary estate, appointment of Settled Land Act trustees, and such mortgages and other dispositions as create paramount estates. At first no doubt, the compiling of an abstract will be a work of somewhat more difficulty than at the present. The practitioner will have to assimilate the scheme and understand what has to be inserted and what omitted, and this will require both learning and skill. But the necessary familiarity with the scheme should be easily acquired. It is simply carrying further the principle applied when the abstract shews a mortgagee or executor's title to sell. The compiler has to decide what is material and what is not. If the scheme is otherwise feasible, this shortening of abstracts ranks as a chief advantage.

We have now been through the leading features of the Conveyancing Bill. We had intended to include an examination of the proposed changes in registration of title in this series of articles, but this will be impracticable. The series has already run to undue length, and it will be better to defer for a time the second branch of the subject. For the present it is sufficient to say that the system of confining proprietary estates to the fee simple and terms of years will be extended to registered land, so that in this respect the system of private conveyancing and registration will be uniform (Conveyancing Bill, clause 41). We shall conclude these articles next week with some general observations on the scheme of the Conveyancing Bill.

[To be concluded.]

Reviews.

Books of the Week.

Workmen's Compensation.—Reports of Cases under the Workmen's Compensation Acts. Also Cases on Insurance Law, including those under the National Insurance Act (inclusive of Marine Insurance). Edited by WILLIAM E. GORDON, M.A., Barrister-at-Law. 1913, Part 3. Stevens & Sons (Limited); Sweet & Maxwell (Limited). Subscription for 1913. 12s. 6d.

New Orders, &c.

The Opening of the Law Courts.

The Lord Chancellor will receive the Lord Mayor-Elect at the House of Lords on Monday, the 13th inst., at 11.15 a.m.

On the same day at 11.45 a.m. there will be a special service in Westminster Abbey. Places will be reserved for the judges, King's Counsel, and officers of the Supreme Court who may attend.

The Dean will receive the judges at the west door.

King's Counsel, officers, and other judicial and official persons will enter by Dean's-yard, while the Junior Bar will enter by Jerusalem Chamber.

The Lord Chancellor's reception at the House of Lords will take place at 12.45 after the service in the Abbey.

Law Students' Journal.

Law Students' Societies.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.—A meeting of the above society was held at the Law Society's Hall, Chancery-lane, on October 7th. Chairman, Mr. W. S. Jones. The subject for debate was "That the Government does not deserve the confidence of the country." Mr. F. Burgis opened in the affirmative, Mr. H. G. Meyer seconded in the affirmative. The following members continued the debate:—Messrs. Jacobs, Krauss, Penny, Ennes, Gisborne, Woodbridge, Finegan (visitor), and Bennett. The motion was carried by four votes.

BIRMINGHAM LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.—A meeting of the above society was held at the Law Library, Bennetts Hill, Birmingham, on Tuesday, October 7th. Frank B. Darling, Esq., presided. The following gentlemen were elected ordinary members:—Messrs. W. N. C. Clark, R. N. M. Clarkson (B.A.), D. H. Cochrane, A. W. Fulwood, C. S. Smith (B.A., LL.B.), and D. W. Woodbridge. The following moot point was discussed:—Mr. Cox has at the back of his shop a door leading to his private apartments on the upper floor. Close to this is a flight of steps leading to a cellar, and ordinarily covered by a trapdoor, which is suitable for the purpose in all respects. Mr. Cox invites Mr. Brown to his house. As Mr. Brown is leaving he falls down the cellar steps, the trapdoor covering of which has been carelessly left open by Mr. Cox's servant. Can Mr. Brown, who is severely injured, successfully sue Mr. Cox? Mr. A. Wilson opened in the affirmative, and was supported by Messrs. D. A. Daniels, B. S. Atkinson, O. Bergendorff, B. B. Davis, S. H. Robinson, and W. N. C. Clark. Mr. C. Coley (B.A., LL.B.) opened in the negative, and was supported by Messrs. W. F. Horden, L. B. Terry, F. H. Wayne, and T. G. Mander. After the leaders had replied, the chairman summed up, and on the motion being put to the meeting, it was carried. Affirmative, 12; negative, 6.

Legal News.

Changes of Partnership. Dissolutions.

CHARLES OLIVER BIGG and EDWARD HENRY NASH, solicitors (Wood, Bigg, & Nash), 6, Raymond-buildings, Gray's-inn, London, W.C. July 17.

FREDERICK SMITH, JOHN CARR, and JAMES GRAHAM ALEXANDER, solicitors (Grace, Smith, & Co.), 41, Castle-street, in the city of Liverpool. Sept. 30. So far as concerns the said Frederick Smith, who retires from the said firm. [Gazette, Oct. 3.]

General.

A "hunger striker," says the *Times*, has died at Bedford Prison. At the inquest yesterday it was stated that Albert Davis, who was undergoing a sentence of fifteen months' hard labour for theft, absolutely refused to take food, but he occasionally drank a little milk. In reply to the foreman of the jury, the Governor of the prison said it was not necessary to acquaint the Home Secretary with the prisoner's refusal unless forcible feeding was resorted to. The jury returned a verdict of "Death from natural causes."

Mr. P. B. Morle, says the *Times*, applied at Westminster County Court on the 3rd inst. for judgment in a case in which he appeared for the plaintiff. He said that the action was before the court on the

18th of June, and terms of settlement were endorsed by himself and counsel for the defendant on their briefs. The defendant was to pay by the 29th of August, but he had not done so, and judgment was now asked for. The endorsement on his brief was duly stamped. Judge Woodfall entered judgment for the plaintiff with costs, and asked why the endorsement was stamped. Mr. Morle: It has to be. His Honour: Why is a stamp necessary? Mr. Morle: It is an agreement and requires a sixpenny stamp. We also have to stamp our vouchers on our briefs for our fees.

The comparative monthly summary of sales of estates for September is as follows:—

	Sept., 1912.	Sept., 1913.
	£	£
The Mart	42,220	21,926
Country and Suburban	157,020	134,655
Private Contract... ..	56,100	63,580
	£255,340	£220,161

Mr. Symmons at Greenwich Police Court last Saturday resumed the hearing of a charge against Chas. Letchford, 38, of Azof-street, East Greenwich, of loitering for the purpose of betting in that street. Mr. Symmons, without hearing evidence for the defence, dismissed the charge on a point of law. He said that one of the police officers had stated that the defendant was walking like a professional on his way home from work. This, the constable said, was at the beginning of his journey, but he took about ten minutes to cover 100 or 150 yards, including three or four minutes spent in conversation with one of the men from whom he was alleged to have received a bet. Mr. Symmons said he did not think it would be loitering if a man walking from work was joined by another man who said, "Put me half-a-crown on a dead cert." Neither was this case one of frequenting.

At the Central Criminal Court on the 7th inst., says the *Times*, the Recorder, in his charge to the grand jury, remarked that some of the cases in the calendar were of great length and complexity, and their hearing would most likely occupy a considerable time. Proceeding to discuss the case in which John Edwin Cole is charged with the manslaughter of a boy who was knocked down in a narrow thoroughfare in Acton by a large and powerful motor-car driven by the defendant, the Recorder said he thought the case proved the necessity for some alteration of the law with regard to these motor vehicles, which were becoming larger and larger. People now seemed to desire to be driven about the country in huge motor machines which wore out the roads and were a very serious danger to the public. He was informed that there was no power in county councils to regulate what roads these immense vehicles should use. It was quite certain that narrow country lanes were never intended for such vehicles, and in his opinion it was desirable that county councils should approach the Local Government Board with the object of getting the Board to lay down some definite regulations as to the width of roads along which these heavy vehicles should pass.

In the City of London Court on the 3rd inst., says the *Times*, a case came before Mr. Registrar Anstey Wild, in a claim made by Mr. Marcus Dreyfus, a German solicitor, Queen Victoria-street, E.C., against Charles Leake, Hanley-road, Hornsey, for £9 7s. 11d. for drawing a partnership deed and translations and copies made. Mr. Lea, solicitor, for the plaintiff, said the work was done in Queen Victoria-street. The Registrar said he saw by the particulars attached to the summons that the plaintiff was suing for "an agreed fee as per authorized scale." Was the plaintiff a solicitor? Mr. Lea said the plaintiff was a German solicitor. The Registrar said the plaintiff was charging for services rendered in drawing a partnership deed and was coming to that court to sue for the recovery of the debt. He could not allow that to be done, and he thought the best way to deal with the matter was to adjourn the case and send the papers to the Law Society. It was a case of an unauthorized person practising as a lawyer. Eventually, at the request of Mr. Lea, the case stood adjourned for the attendance of Mr. Dreyfus, the Registrar remarking that, although wishing to be perfectly friendly with Germans, he was not going to have them come over here and practise English professions as well as engage in English businesses. He thought the present was a case for a police court summons.

Messrs. Trollope have sold the Freehold Properties, 40, Great Peter-street, and 38, Buckingham-gate, Westminster, by private treaty.

NEW ZEALAND GOVERNMENT LOAN.—On another page the issue is announced of £3,500,000 New Zealand Government Four per Cent. Ten Years' Convertible Debentures, applications for which will be received by the Bank of England at the price of 98½ per cent.

The next examinations of candidates for admission into the Society of Incorporated Accountants and Auditors will be held in England, Scotland and Ireland on November 24th, 25th, 26th and 27th.

WHY PAY RENT? Take an Immediate Mortgage free in event of death from the **SCOTTISH TEMPERANCE LIFE ASSURANCE CO. (LIMITED)**. Repayments usually less than rent. Mortgage expenses paid by the Company. Prospectus from 3, Cheapside, E.C. Phone 6002 Bank.—Adv.

Court Papers.

Supreme Court of Judicature.

ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE OF				
Date.	EMERGENCY ROTA.	APPEAL COURT No. 1.	Mr. Justice JONES.	Mr. Justice WARRINGTON.
Monday Oct. 13	Mr. Borrer	Mr. Bloxam	Mr. Farmer	Mr. Synges
Tuesday 14	Leach	Jolly	Synges	Borrer
Wednesday ... 15	Goldschmidt	Greswell	Bloxam	Jolly
Thursday 16	Farmer	Leach	Goldschmidt	Bloxam
Friday 17	Church	Borrer	Leach	Goldschmidt
Saturday 18	Synges	Goldschmidt	Church	Farmer
Date.	Mr. Justice NAYLOR.	Mr. Justice EVELL.	Mr. Justice HARGREY.	Mr. Justice ASHBURN.
Monday Oct. 13	Mr. Greswell	Mr. Goldschmidt	Mr. Leach	Mr. Jolly
Tuesday 14	Church	Bloxam	Goldschmidt	Mr. Greswell
Wednesday ... 15	Leach	Farmer	Church	Borrer
Thursday 16	Borrer	Church	Greswell	Synges
Friday 17	Synges	Greswell	Jolly	Farmer
Saturday 18	Jolly	Leach	Borrer	Bloxam

COURT OF APPEAL.

MICHAELMAS SITTINGS, 1913.

The Appeals or other Business proposed to be taken will, from time to time, be announced in the Daily Cause List.

FROM THE CHANCERY DIVISION, THE PROBATE, DIVORCE AND ADMIRALTY DIVISION (PROBATE AND DIVORCE), AND THE COUNTY PALATINE AND STANNARIES COURTS. (General List.)

1912.
In re Sharp, dec Steward v Steward

1913.
In re Drewell, dec Storr v Drewell

Shropshire and Montgomeryshire Light Ry Co v The Cambrian Rys Co
Oram v Hutt and ors

In re Allsop, dec Whittaker v Bamford and anr

De Lisle v The Union Bank of Scotland ld and anr

Norton v W H Barker & Son
Farquharson and anr v Dalkeith (Ceylon) Rubber and Tea Estates ld and ors

Grose v Briggs and ors
Long and ors v Gray and ors

In re Witty, dec Wright v Robinson and ors

In re Samuel Blow, dec St. Bartholomew's Hospital v Cambden and ors

In re Cattell, dec Cattell and ors v Cattell and ors

Companies Winding Up In re The Companies (Consolidation) Act, 1908 and In re The London and Johannesburg Trust Co ld

In the Matter of the Estate of Jacob Swinton, dec John Swinton, dec and anr v Peake, Lowe and anr

Mitchell v Mosley
In the Matter of the Midland Express ld Pearson v The Company

In re J P Kidston, dec Kidston v Kidston

In re Charles Kipping, dec Kipping v Kipping

The New Inverted Incandescent Gas Lamp Co ld v M Howlett & Co

E Jessop v F R Turner
M A Jessop v F R Turner

In the Matter of The Woking Urban District Council (Basingstoke Canal) Act, 1911, 1 & 2 Geo. V., Cap. c. VII. L & S W Canal ld (in liquidation) v The Woking U D C

Lyons, Son & Co v Gulliver
In re Morrison, Jones & Taylor ld

Cookes v The Company
In re A Williams, dec Muirhead v Gregory

In re Gordon & Adams' Contract and In re the Vendor and Purchaser Act, 1874 In re Pritchard's Settled Estate and In re the Settled Land Acts, 1882 to 1890

In re J T Gray, dec Badger v Gray

In re M M Mudge, dec and In re the Settled Land Acts Eastwood v Ashton

In re H D Marshall, dec Marshall and ors v Marshall and ors
Lucas v Hall

In re R Pennington, dec Pennington v Pennington
The British Vacuum Cleaning Co ld v James Robertshaw & Sons ld

A G Spalding & Bros v A W Gamage ld and ors
In re C G Spencer's Settlement Trusts Richmond v Spencer

George Leslie Estates v Russ
In re Martha Bowen, dec Heald v Dickinson and ors

Gee and ors v Liddell and ors
Companies Winding Up In re the Companies (Consolidation) Act, 1905 and In re the Premier Underwriting Assoc ld

In re W R Blackwell, dec Blackwell v Blackwell
Corelli v Gray and ors Same v Same

The Bowden Brake Co ld v Rowden Wire ld
Pearcy v Holtham

In re The Companies (Consolidation) Act, 1908, Section 32 and In re Martins ld
In re John Thomas James Piddington, dec Emson v Piddington and ors

In the Matter of the Companies (Consolidation) Act, 1908 and In the Matter of the Blair Open Hearth Furnace Co ld
Carlisle v The Oroya Exploration Co ld Hall v The Same

Dysart and anr v Hammerton
G M Bebb v The Law Soc
The Omnium Insee Corpn ld v The United London and Scottish Insee Co ld and anr

Manchester District Registry In re Eliza Augusta Gardom, dec Le Page and anr v Attorney-Gen and ors
The Newfoundland Exploration Syndicate ld v Lehwass

Bowden Wire ld v The Bowden Brake Co ld
In the Matter of the Trusts of William Tattersall, dec Lund and anr v Jamieson and ors
Harwood v Harmouth

In re John Lewis, dec Mitchell v Hunt
 James Keith & Blackman Co ld v The Tilley High Pressure Gas Syndicate ld
 In the Matter of the Estate of John Gurden, dec Gurden v Gurden
 Omnium Electric Palaces ld v Haines & Heussler
 Whitaker v Harris
 In re G H Cattermole Davison, dec Cattermole Davison v Munby
 Hewett v Peach
 Same v Same
 Same v Same
 Hewson and anr v Shelley and ors
 In the Matter of the Tilt Cove Copper Co ld The Trustees, Executors and Securities Insee Corpn ld and ors v The Company and ors
 In the Matter of the Companies (Consolidation) Act, 1908 and in the Matter of the Law Guarantee Trust and Accident Soc ld
 In re Pearce, dec The Alliance Assee Co ld v Frances
 In re The Carlagena (Colombia) Ry Co ld and In re The Cos (Consolidation) Act, 1908
 Hopcroft v Hopcroft & Norris ld
 Hopcroft & Norris ld v Hopcroft and anr
 In re The X L Electric Co ld Wiener v The Company
 In re Newbould, dec Carter v Newbould
 In re P C Smith, dec Smith v Smith
 Parr v Gaiety Picture Palaces ld
 In re William Cresswell, dec Lineham v Cresswell and ors
 In re T H Archer-Hind, dec Dunn v Archer-Hind

FROM THE CHANCERY AND PROBATE AND DIVORCE DIVISIONS.

(Interlocutory List.)

1912.
 Nicholson v Freeland and anr
 1913.
 Mitchell v East Sussex County Council
 Henderson v William Younger & Co ld anr
 Divorce Salis Bismas Day v Lily L Bismas Day (in forma pauperis) v H E D Lloyd & S M Omar, Co-respondents
 P S B Hall v Knight & Baxter

FROM THE COUNTY PALATINE COURT OF LANCASTER.

(General List.)

1913.
 In re Arthur Franklyn, dec Franklyn v Franklyn
 In re Edwin Gaukroger, dec Beaumont and anr v Gaukroger and anr (Manchester District Registry)
 In re John Fletcher, dec In re Sarah Fletcher, dec Johnston v Miller and ors (Manchester District Registry)
 In re Charles Roger Jacson, dec Peel v Jacson (Liverpool District Registry)

FROM THE KING'S BENCH DIVISION.

(In Bankruptcy.)

In re A Debtor (expte The Debtor), No 2 of 1913
 In re A Debtor (expte The Debtor), No. 14 of 1913

FROM THE KING'S BENCH DIVISION.

(Final List.)

Judgment Reserved.

The King, on the prosecution of William Arlidge v Local Government Board

FROM THE KING'S BENCH DIVISION.

(Final and New Trial List.)

1911.

McRae v Penman (Gee & Sheen 3rd parties)

1912.

Gooda and anr v Drake and anr
 The Woodfield Steamship Co ld v The Rio de Janeiro Lighterage Co ld

Royal London Mutual Insee Soc v Kingsland

Temple v Donaldson

The Egyptian Hotels ld v James Mitchell (Surveyor of Taxes) 1913.

The King, on the prosecution of Neville and anr v The Monmouthshire Compensation Authority

Hollis v Barrasford & Curd

Dando v Deeley

Blyth Shipbuilding and Dry Docks Co ld v Adams and anr

Robinson v Attwood

Holland & Hannen & Cubitts ld v Decies

Blinko v Layton

Mehta v Sutton

Hague Bros v H Briggs & Son ld
 W Newbold & Co ld v Scriven & Co

Vacuum Oil Co ld v Ellis (Howard Garnishe—Ellison, clmt)

Bradford & Sons ld v Bown

Monckton v Pathe Freres Pathephone ld

Bolam (applt) v Allgood (respt)

Norman v Quilter

Hiam v Cambrian Ry Co

Crosby and anr v The London General Omnibus Co

Arlidge v Baker Street Motor Car Bazaar ld

Juler v The Tunbridge Wells Gas Co

Monti v Bloch & Klein

Dominy v Beaumont

Upjohn v Willesden Urban District Council

Richards v Wrexham and Acton Collieries

Davies v Same

Bessant & Son v Chatham Empire ld

Jones v Keegan

Ingram & Royle ld v Services Maritimes du Treport ld

In re The London Building Act, 1894 Clode v The London County Council

Rome v Rome

Skeate v Slaters ld

Dunlop Tyre Co v Selfridge & Co ld

Lawrence's Stores ld v Wallis & Stevens ld

Attorney-Gen (at the relation of the Mayor & of the City of Worcester) v Sharpness New Docks & Co

Hueffer v Illustrated Journals ld
 White v Ross and anr

Richards v Turner and anr

Leicester v Dixon

Betts v Curtis and anr

Haas v The Atlas Insee Co ld

In the Matter of the Arbitration Act, 1889 and In the Matter of an Arbitration between Wilkinson and The Car and General Insee Corpn ld

The Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co ld v New Garage and Motor Co ld

Morrison v London County and Westminster Bank ld

Bestermann v British Motor Cab Co and anr

H K Reeves v L M Pope and L M Pope v H K Reeves and ors

Warner International and Overseas Engineering Co ld v Kilburn Brown & Co

Allen v The Great Eastern Ry Co and ors

Gale v Preston

Dickson v J A Scott

White v Barnes

Johnson Billington Electricity Meters ld v Billington

In the Matter of an Arbitration between Henry Sidney and The North Eastern Ry Co

Lewis v G Davies (E Davies clmt)

Warham v Selfridge & Co ld

Major & Co ld v John Watt & Co ld

Associated Newspapers ld and ors v The Mayor & of London

Cointat v T Myham & Son

E V King v Parker

Hollis Bros & Co and ors v Groedel

Bros Steamship Co ld and ors

Biddell v Jackson

Hallett v Hughes

Eberhart v Collins

Lonn v Coppee

Thompson v H & W Nelson ld

Dyer v Steinland

Walter v Whiteman

Jameson v Garlick

Spencers ld v Meyrick

Williams v McCombie

Nelson v James & Sons ld

Rodocanachi & Reynolds ld v C J Hambro & Son

Mathew v The Times Publishing Co ld

Chantrey v London Theatres of Varieties ld

Standard Private Finance Co of Ireland ld v Pitman

Cohen v Haynes and ors

Evans v Givernraeth Anthracite Collieries ld

Countess Clarendon v Heydeman Franklin & Co v Dawson

Holding v Bankes and anr

Reed v London Theatres of Varieties ld

Nightingale v Parsons

Skidmore v Walsh

Mayor & of Gateshead v Lumsden

Morgan v Gray

Crosbie v Beales

In the Matter of an Arbitration between the County Council of the North Riding of Yorkshire and The Middlesbrough County Council

London Trades Shipping Co ld v The Gen Mercantile Shipping Co ld

Reece (trading as J Blake & Co) v Kingsmill and ors

H K Judd & Co ld v London and South Western Bank ld

Crack v Hayward

Hurlstone v London Electric Ry Co and anr

Allis Chalmers & Co v Fidelity Deposit Co of Maryland

Hughes and ors v Fossick

Wolf v R H Halford & Sons ld

Wigmore v Harris

R Leslie ld v Shiell

Hughes v Roberts

Bown v Cory

Parkyn and anr v Dunbar

The General Estates Co ld v Beaver

Hippolyte Sohm v Kilsby

Pilling v South Kirkby, Featherstone and Hemsworth Collieries Co ld

Streathfield v New Central Omnibus Co ld

Cooper and ors v Crawford

Hardinge v Woodbridge & Flint Betts v The Yorkshire Insee Co ld and Debenhams ld

Same v Same

In re The Agricultural Holdings Act, 1908, and In re an Arbitration between J Osborne and A W Shaw

Shoerats v Shoerats

Western Electric Co ld v Great Eastern Ry Co

Tucker v Newman and ors

Griffin v Maitland

Societe des Hotels Reunis v Hawker

Hughes v Margett's International Sectional Tyre Co ld and ors

Bendix v Chilian Syndicate ld and anr

Stuart v Meyer & Co

Dixon v Troesans Estates ld

Denyer v Sauter

Burnett v Samuel

Jenkins v Cohen

Garlick v Jameson Bidlake v Lintner

Higgins v Power

Fillis v London General Omnibus Co ld

Dallimore v Williams and anr Ormsby v The Troesans Estates ld

Thorn v Alhambra Co ld

Moseley v Blaisdell

Priest v McClymont

Watney, Combe, Reid & Co ld v Berners

Bates v Batey & Co ld

Chancer v Weisberg

Ryan v The Oceanic Steam Navigation Co ld

O'Connell v Same

Scanlon v Same

O'Brien v Same

Mather v Thackersey and ors The Western Steamship Co ld v Amaral, Sutherland & Co ld

Glyn v Holophane ld

Dankwerts v French & Plucknett and ors

Nicholson v Cowen and anr

Double v Ramuz

Stracey v Ling & Co ld

United States Steel Products Co v Great Western Ry Co

Home Counties Transport Co ld v Gasson, Cockerill & Co ld

E Dean & Beal ld v Société Anonyme des Chocolats au lait F L Cailler

Street v Royal Exchange Assee Charing Cross, West End and City Electricity Supply Co ld v

London Hydraulic Power Co

Bailey and ors v Lord Mayor & of Manchester

Reilly v Mayor & of Salford

Homer v London Brighton and South Coast Ry

Toronto Ry Co and ors v National British and Irish Millers Insee Co ld

Ryall v Kidwell

Dobkin v Lisle

Bennett Steamship Co v Hull Mutual Steamship Protecting Soc ld

Rees v Lewisham Borough Council Capital and Counties Bank ld v Wright

Ford v Old Wharf, Paradise Street (Birmingham) Properties ld

Jones and anr v T P Jordon & Co

North Central Wagon Co ld v Neath and Brecon Ry Co

Firth v Layton

Marquis Camden v Commrs of Inland Revenue

Davies and ors v Glamorgan Coal Co ld

H.M. Postmaster - General v Hendon Urban District Council (Railway and Canal Commission)
 London County Council v Allen and ors
 Same v Same
 Bricault-Romain v Invincible and General Insee Co ld and anr
 Harrison v D J Keymer & Co de Woolf v de Leef
 Anderson v Caves
 George E Fox ld v Price
 Wootton v Sievier and ors
 Steptey and Bow Educational Authority v The Commrs of Inland Revenue (Revenue Side)
 Muhesa Rubber Plantations ll and Robert William Elder v Hillekes
 Poad v Scarborough Union
 In re an Arbitration between W H T Porter, Applicant and Sir E H Fraser and ors, Reapts
 In re A E G Champion, one of the Solicitors of the Supreme Court
 Wilkinson v E T Holdsworth & Co ld
 Kacianoff and ors v China Traders' Insee Co ld
 Westborough Urban District Council v Bursley British Co-operative Soc ld
 Drummond v J W Collins, Surveyor of Taxes (Revenue Side)
 Mygatt v Glyn
 The King v Income Tax Commissioners
 Marwood v General Argentine Ry Co
 Power v Bulnois
 In re Bernard Boaler and In re The Vexatious Actions Act, 1896
 Morgan v White
 Pim v Sayers and ors
 Norman & Beard ld v General Steam Navigation Co ld
 McRae v Penman
 Lay v Hill's Gas Plants ld
 London and Asiatic Tea Co ld v Faulding
 Newman v Victoria Bazaar Co (1906) ld
 Brooks v Commrs of Inland Revenue
 Cooke v Sutcliffe
 Killar v Robin
 Forbes v Samuel
 Produce Brokers Co ld v Olymian Oil and Cake Co ld

FROM THE PROBATE, DIVORCE AND ADMIRALTY DIVISION (ADMIRALTY).

With Nautical Assessors.

(Final List.)

1912.

The Charits—1912 Folio 51 The Owners of the Steamship Charita v The Cardiff Ry Co
 The Cambric—1912—Folio 358 The East Asiatic Co ld, The Owners of the Steamship Arabian v W H Cockerline & Co., Owners of Steamship or Vessel Cambric
 The Glasgow—1912—Folio 137 The Owners of the late Steamship Hatfield v The Owners of the Steamship Glasgow. The Glasgow—1912—H—No 587—Folio 137 Same v Same
 The Ennisbrook—1912—L—No 1,057—Folio 399 The Owners of Steamship Lady Salisbury v The Owners of Steamship Ennisbrook
 The Blazer—1912—Folios 514 and 518 The Berrett Steamship Co ld v The Goole and Hull Steam Towing Co ld

The SS. Marie Gartz—1912—Folio 388 The Owners of Steamship Kaarama v The Owners of the SS. Marie Gartz
 The Galileo 1912—1912—Folio 182 The Owners of cargo lately taken on board the Steamship Galileo v Thomas Wilson Son & Co ld
 The Domira—1913—Folio 30 The Commander, Officers and Crew of H.M.S. Melpomene v The Steamship Domira Co ld
 The Mariana—1912—Folio 325 The Nestle and Anglo-Swiss Condensed Milk Co v The British India Steam Navigation Co ld
 The Junio—1912—Folio 503 The Owners of the Dutch Steamship Dordrecht v The Owners of the Spanish Steamship Junio and freight
 The Elswick Grange—1913—Folios 51 and 55 (consolidated) The Owners of the Steamship Speranza v The Owners of the Steamship Elswick Grange
 The Phœbus—1913—Folios 270 and 280 (consolidated) The Owners of the Steamship Baharistan and the Owners of her cargo v The Owners of the Steamship Phœbus and her freight

Without Nautical Assessors.

The Cairnbahn—1912—Folios 11 and 218 (consolidated) The Owners of Hopper Barges, Nos. 2 and 5 v The Owners of Steamship Cairnbahn and Owners of Nunthorpe
 The Ophelia—1910—Folio 113 The Owners of Steamship or Vessel Annis v The Owners of Steamship or Vessel Ophelia (Interlocutory List.)
 The Cairnbahn—1912—Folios 11 and 218 (consolidated) The Owners of the Hopper Barge No. 205 v The Owners of SS. Cairnbahn and the Owners of the Steam Tug Nunthorpe
 The Bannockburn—1911—Folios 125 and 126 (consolidated) James Westoll and ors, The Owners of Steamship James Westoll v The Owners of Steamship or Vessel Bannockburn and her freight
 The Etona—1912—Folios 449 The Owners of the Steamship Carmargo, her Master and Crew v The Owners of the Steamship Etona
 James Westoll—1913—Folio 323 Hind, Ralph & Co v John Adamson and ors and Robert R Adamson and anr, as Owners of the late steamship or vessel James Westoll

FROM THE KING'S BENCH DIVISION.

(Interlocutory List.)

1911.

Clark v Forster, Same v Same, Forster v Aldridge, In re H Forster (expte J Jackson Clark, in Bankruptcy)

1912

The King v Justices of the County of London and ors (expte Stanley)
 The King v Justices of the County of London and ors (expte the London County Council)

1913

Bright v Vidal
 Scott v Burton

Forbes v Samuel
 Burnett v Samuel
 Bates v Alston
 Gavin, Gibson & Co ld v Gilson
 Wolfe v Roberts and anr
 Kendall v Day
 Hopton v Nightingale
 The Liverpool Victoria Legal Friendly Soc v Freeman
 La Plata Electric Tramways Co ld v Fowler & ors
 Jolly v Brown and ors
 Provand v China and Japan Trading Co
 Harbin v Gordon and anr
 Brindley v Berry
 J J Allen ld v P G Hesse (Otto Hosse, Clmt)
 Spoor v The Greater J D Williams Amusement Co ld
 Spink v Bath
 Beacon Stone Co ld v W J Fryer & Co ld and anr
 Ross v John Ling ld and anr
 London and River Plate Bank ld v The Investment Trust Corp of England ld
 Bond v Beeching

IN RE THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACTS, 1897 AND 1906.

(From County Courts.)

1913.

Trump v Martin
 William Gray & Co ld v Halcrow
 Richards v Morris

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE—CHANCERY DIVISION.

MICHAELMAS SITTINGS, 1913.

NOTICES RELATING TO THE CHANCERY CAUSE LIST.

Mr. Justice JOYCE will take his Business as announced in the Michaelmas Sittings Paper.

Liverpool and Manchester Business.—Mr. Justice JOYCE will take Liverpool and Manchester Business on Saturdays, the 18th October, the 1st, 15th and 29th November and the 13th December.

Mr. Justice WARRINGTON.—Except when other business is advertised in the Daily Cause List, Mr. Justice Warrington will sit for the disposal of His Lordship's Witness List throughout the Sittings. The Court will sit at 10.15 a.m. and rise at 4.15 p.m. each day except Saturdays, when there will be no sitting.

Mr. Justice NEVILLE.—Except when other Business is advertised in the Daily Cause List, Actions with Witnesses will be taken throughout the Sittings. The Court will sit at 10.15 a.m. and rise at 4.15 p.m. each day except Saturdays, when there will be no sitting.

Mr. Justice EVE.—Except when other Business is advertised in the Daily Cause List, Actions with Witnesses will be taken throughout the Sittings. During these Sittings Mr. Justice Eve will sit each day until 4.30 p.m., except on Saturdays, when there will be no sitting.

Mr. Justice SARGANT will take his Business as announced in the Michaelmas Sittings Paper.

Mr. Justice ASTBURY will take his Business as announced in the Michaelmas Sittings Paper.

Summonses before the Judge in Chambers.—Mr. Justice JOYCE, Mr. Justice SARGANT and Mr. Justice ASTBURY will sit in Court every Monday during the Sittings to hear Chamber Summonses.

Summonses Adjourned into Court and Non-Witness Actions will be heard by Mr. Justice JOYCE, Mr. Justice SARGANT and Mr. Justice ASTBURY.

Motions, Petitions and Short Causes will be taken on the days stated in the Michaelmas Sittings Paper.

NOTICE WITH REFERENCE TO THE CHANCERY WITNESS LISTS.

During the Michaelmas Sittings the Judges will sit for the disposal of Witness Actions as follows:—

Mr. Justice WARRINGTON will take the Witness List for WARRINGTON and SARGANT, JJ.

Mr. Justice NEVILLE will take the Witness List for NEVILLE and ASTBURY, JJ.

Mr. Justice EVE will take the Witness List for JOYCE and EVE, JJ.

CHANCERY CAUSES FOR TRIAL OR HEARING.

Set down to October 3rd, 1913.

Before Mr. Justice JOYCE.
 Retained Witness Actions.

Wood v Mayor & Co of Conway
 Chambers v Derham

Theeman v Burrough's Adding Machine ld

Ashby St. Ledgers v Talbot
 Inglis v Collis

Mapp v A Straker & Son, Smith Bros ld

Barnes v Evans & Co
 Harlock v Owners of Ship

Coquet
 Clapp v Carter

Wheatley v The Lumley Brick Co ld

Lloyd v Midland Ry Co
 Zillwood v Winch

Unger v Howell
 Foston v F S Crossland & Sons

Parker v Owners of Ship Black Rock

Bates v J Holding & Co
 Huscroft v Bennett

Bateman v Albion Combing Co ld
 Heeks v Lunch

Jackson v Denton Collieries Co ld
 Pennell & Son v Brockhurst

Parker v Usk Board of Conservators

Thompson v North Eastern Marine Engineering Co ld

Gauttier v The Stephenson Patent Cavity Building Blocks

Hayward v Westleigh Colliery Co ld

Fish v The Old Silkstone Collieries ld

Loftus v Heaths
 Frederick Sellers v The Rural District Council of Boston

N.B.—The above List contains Chancery, Palatine and King's Bench Final and Interlocutory Appeals, &c., set down to

October 3rd, 1913.

In re G A Wedgwood, dec
Randell v Poole
In re W Barnes, dec Dudeney v
Dove
In re De Noailles, dec Tufnell v
Shepherd
In re Wallace, dec Wilkes v
Bone
Clark v Dunn Douding v Whish
In re Maria Knight's Estates and
In re the Settled Land Act,
1882
In re Lemale, dec Boniface v
Boy Scouts' Assoc
Bowden v Bowden
In re C St John, dec St John v
Roberts
In re W B Ochs' Settlement Ochs
v Ochs
In re R W Osmont, dec Wetjen
v Osmont
In re J R Ward, dec Colman v
Rayner
Dauncey v Probert
In re H C Johnson, dec Johnson v
Johnson
In re Claremont Claremont v
Bastard
In re Arthur Cummings, dec
Cummings v Cummings (not
before Oct 31)
In re J M Laycock, dec Laycock
v Laycock
In re C Lock, dec Blake v
Jeffery
In re G Harper, dec Amos v
Miles
In re Murphy, dec Hatten v Cox
In re Cox, dec Cox v Hatten
In re J W Wilson, dec Russell v
Wilson
In re Crawshaw Crawshaw v
Crawshaw
In re S W Kelly, dec and In re
Settled Land Acts, 1882 to 1890
Griffiths v Kelly
In re Butler, dec Butler v Butler
In re A Arnold, dec Arnold v
Arnold
In re Brown Brown v Dickard
In re Yatman's Settlement Trusts
Druce v Pretymann
In re James Raven, dec The
Public Trustee v Raven
In re E Sheffield's Settlement
Pearce v Stone
In re Lucy, dec Dyson v Johnson
In re L Hulbert, dec Hulbert v
Hulbert
In re Cassidy Cassidy v Cassidy
In re W Firth, dec Firth v
Firth
In re J Sutcliffe, dec Leather v
Stansfield
In re C Reinecke, dec Johnson
v Reinecke
In re J N Goatly, dec Goatly v
James
In re Johnson, dec Pitt v John-
son
In re Marquis of Ely, dec Tot-
tenham v Ely
In re Cannington's Settlement
Gawth v Cunningham
Wheeler v Edwards
In re Crawshaw's Settlement
Crawshaw v Rossetti
In re Barkworth Barkworth v
The Public Trustee
In re W Evans, dec Evans v
Thomas
In re James Wallis, dec Wallis
v Wallis
Turner v Franklin-Adams
In re Wm Johns, dec Allen v
Johns
In re Wm Pollard, dec Thomas
v Thomas
Mercedes Daimler Motor Co ld v
F.I.A.T. Motor Cab Co ld
Same v Same

In re J W Prior's Will Bishop v
Prior
In re Sampson's Settlement Samp-
son v Durham
In re Sir Thomas Erskine Perry's
Settlement
In re St Ann's Well Brewery Co
ld St Ann's Well Brewery Co
v Snow
In re S R Zunz, dec Gardner v
Mount Vernon Hospital
In re Chambers' Settlement Pat-
tersen v Chambers
In re T Wilkinson, dec Rawnsley
v Townley
Actiengesellschaft fur anilin fabri-
kation in Berlin v Levinstein ld
Same v Same
In re Edwd Norman, dec Nor-
man v Norman
In re Hunter Dick v Sim
In re Glenny, dec Royal Medical
Benevolent Fund v Glenny
In re Craven, dec Metcalfe v
Maw
In re Cohen, dec Cohen v Nathan
In re Diplock, dec Diplock v
Butler
In re John Marnham, dec Marn-
ham v Marnham
In re Allen, dec Lange v Allen
In re James Ingham, dec Ingham
v Ingham
In re Same Same v Same
In re Oxley, dec John Hornby &
Sons v Oxley
Before Mr. Justice WARRINGTON.
Retained Matters.
Causes for Trial (with Witnesses).
(From Mr Justice SWINFEN EADY's
List.)
Grosslicht v Patent Protection
Assoc ld
In re W G Probyn, dec Probyn
v Drayton
Adjourned Summonses.
Government of the Republic of
Colombia v Colombian Emerald Co
ld and ors
In Camerá (by order).
In re Betts, infants In re Betts'
Settlement
In re Inglis, infants In re
Guardianship of Infants Act,
1886
In re Lowndes dec, Amphlett v
Attorney-Gen
Petition.
Talbot v Scarisbrick (restored)
Motions.
Pearson v Pickering (s o gene-
rally)
In re Gordon Stainer v Gordon
(s o to Oct. 20)
Korkis v Weir with witnesses, by
order (s o to fix date)
Causes for Trial (with Witnesses).
Mendelssohn v Traies & Son (s o
pending settlement)
In re M S Cooper, dec Reeder v
Curtis and ors (s o until further
order)
In re Kenrick & Jefferson's
Patent, No. 6,629, of 1903 (s o
for amendment of specification)
Mills v Grundherr action (s o
liberty to apply to restore)
Brown v Brown action (not be-
fore October 18)
Mercedes Daimler Motor Co ld v
John Marston ld (s o generally)
Barnes v Goldfinch (stayed for
security)
Nauntun and ors v Whitehouse
action (s o)
Goodhind v Bexon (s o until
further order)

LAW REVERSIONARY INTEREST SOCIETY.

LIMITED.

THANET HOUSE, 231-232 STRAND, LONDON, W.C.

ESTABLISHED 1853.

Capital Stock £400,000

Debenture Stock £331,130

REVERSIONS PURCHASED. ADVANCES MADE THEREON.

Forms of Proposal and full information can be obtained at the Society's Office.
G. H. MAYNE, Secretary.

Mansell v The Tirdonkin Collieries
ld (s o further order)
In the Matter of Letters Patent,
No. 26,671 of 1906, granted to
George Albert Smith, and In
the Matter of the Patents and
Designs Act, 1907
W A Sanders v Geo S Ferdinando
Geo S Ferdinando v W A
Sanders (s o generally)
Gabb v Richards and ors (s o
generally)
Hughes v Evans (s o generally)
Hydroil ld v Joseph Crosfield &
Sons ld
In re G T Congreve, dec Moxon
& ors v Dransfield (s o generally)
The Commissioners of Works v
King (s o for day to be fixed)
Wright and ors v Wright and anr
(stayed for filing of depositions)
Brodrick v Shepherd-Cross
Edward Ernest Lehwass v The
Newfoundland Oil (Parent) De-
velopment Syndicate ld and anr
Dunn v Essen
Attorney-Gen. in relation to Pick-
fords ld v The Great Northern
Ry Co
Payne v The Ecclesiastical Com-
missioners for England and anr
James Ochs v Ochs Bros. and anr
Little v Hercules Tyre Co
Nobbs v Jones
In re Davison's Settlement Davi-
son v Munby
Grove v The County Borough of
Swansea
Lund v Polden
In re a Settlement, dated 8th
June, 1861 Franklen v Bar-
rington and ors
Medcalf v Medcalf
The Lutterworth Freehold Land
Building and Waterworks Co ld
v Grosvenor
Brookbank v National Standard
Life Assce Corpn ld
Lucas v Lucas

Before Mr. Justice NEVILLE.
Retained Matters
Motion
In re Meiros Colliery Syndicate ld
(with witnesses).

Adjourned Summonses.
In re Ogilvie's Estate and In re
Settled Land Acts, 1882 and
1890
In re G Wood, dec Wood v
Wood (s o to Oct. 20)
In re H F G Coleman's Trusts
Toller v Pochin pt hd (s o)
In re the Companies (Consolida-
tion) Act, 1908, and In re the
Cameron's Colonial Products ld
motion
In re Marsden's Will Trusts
Searl v Smith (pt hd—s o
generally)
Stratton v Simonds (with wit-
nesses)
In re Jephson Moore-George v
Jephson
In re Blott's Estate Blott v Blott
In re Lindsay Lindsay v Ayrton
In re J M Allen Trevor v Daniell
Causes for Trial (with Witnesses).
Morse v The Garnant Anthracite
Collieries ld

Garnant Anthracite Collieries ld
v Morse
Gordon v Wells
Roan v Roan
In re Hopkins, dec Streeter v
Dyer
Lawson v Lawson
Leaning v Pearl Life Assce Co
Pearl Life Assce Co v Densham
and ors
In re Keighley Electrical En-
gineering Co ld Ickringill v
Holmes
Evershed & Vignoles ld v Paul
In re Gledhill, dec Gledhill v
Beaumont
Maycock v Bell
Parker v Young
Melbourne v Lyons
Pearson v Richard-Wade, Sons &
Co ld
Taylor v Willey
Hodgson v Borrett
Munday v South Metropolitan
Electric Light and Power Co
Same v New Gutta Percha Co ld
Harris v Lurion
In re Philip Keen, dec Keen v
Mirams
Lemmens v Everett, Edgcumbe &
Co ld
David Lloyd Pigott & Co v F J
Coles & Co
Latham v Negus
In re J Scutt, dec In re Josias
Crodd, dec In re E Kellaway,
dec Scutt v Ensor
Goodwin, Ferreira & Co ld v Leite
Moon v Pople
Fowler v Carter
Jones v Davies
Walshe v Moylett's Stores ld
The Natural Color Kinematograph
Co ld v Somersald & Co
Dore v Weber
Flumson v Coldham & Birkett
Robins v Robins
Pidoux & Cook v Benckendorff,
Berger & Co Benckendorff,
Berger & Co v Bruce
Wissler v Palace Restaurants ld
Ernest Firth & Sons v Taylor,
Yielding & Co
Nawrocki v Nawrocki
In re M A Kerford, dec Job v
Pilcher
The Oxford Picture Palace Co ld
v Stuart
Rossdale v Appenrodt
Harriid v William H Cook ld
Holt v Armitage & Norton
Pollard v How
Gibbons v London Theatres of
Varieties ld
Barker v Russell
Triton v Ward, Lock & Co
Hardy v Richardson
Robinson v Miller
Lewis & Allenby (1909) ld v Pegge
Stroud v Govett
Sloan v Hatchard
Anglo-Swedish Electric, &c Co v
British Arc Welding Co
Holton v Reed
XL Electric Co ld v Aron
Thornhill v Weeks
Last v Hucklebury
Fowke v Berington
Belt v Wyre
Clements v Edwards
Ashburton v Wemyss and ors
In re Rees Proctor v Rees

Pessers, Moody, Wraith & Gunn
ld v Cresset Automatic Machine
Co

Lawson v J H Walker & Co
Hanks v Gilbert
Johnson v Doyle
Stubbs ld v A Bennett & Co ld

Before Mr. Justice EVE.
Retained Matters.
Motions.

Fitzwell v Cran
In re James Ainslie & Co's Trade
Mark and In re The Trade
Marks Act, 1905.
Langford v The Nestle and Anglo-
Swiss Condensed Milk Co

Adjourned Summonses.
In re Clifford, dec Clifford v de
Pinna pt hd

In re Duke of Manchester's
Settled Estates Buccleuch v
Manchester

In re Fowler Hutchinson v
Fowler
In re C A Evans, dec Mayne v
Waller

Ray v Flower-Ellis
In re J J Grinlinton, dec Public
Trustee v Grinlinton

In re G Meadows, dec Meadows
v Meadows
In re C Owen's Estate Purchase v
Owen

Rowe Bros v Walker, Parker &
Co

Causes for Trial (with Witnesses).
Coombe v Mendit ld pt hd
Cohn v Fairhead

Jackson v Cording (s o generally)
In re Fellows, dec D'Arcy v
Corker

In re Burton, dec Burton v
Burton pt hd (s o until liberty
to restore)

Elven v Lawson (s o)
Gas Economising and Improved
Light Syndicate v Blanchard
Lamp Patents Co

Horton's Estate ld v Crockford,
Grove & Sons ld (s o)

Leon v Slomnicki
Rose v Chesham U D C
Clarke v Baku Standard Agency
ld

Marconi v Helaby Wireless Tele-
graph Co

Re-insurance Guarantees Co v Nat.
Provincial Insee Co

In re Rothwell, dec Birch v
Rothwell

Exchange Telegraph Co v Green-
wood's Exchange

Robbins v Olivey
Howard Asphalt Troughing Co ld
v Co-operative Wholesale Soc ld

Gordon v Power
In re Hiller, dec Hiller v Hiller
Thomas v Hughes

In re J H Matthews, dec Satch-
well v Matthews

Jenkins & Co ld v Thomas &
John Brocklebank ld

Libraco ld v Shaw-Walker ld
Martin v Whitton

In re L T Green's Settlement Re-
version Purchase Co ld v Carr

In re Evison, dec Fawcett v
Evison

Heron v Varney
In re W Featherstone, dec Morris
v Featherstone

Appenrod v The London County
Council

Whitworth v Hallatt
Lloyd v Shadwell
Ray Mead Hotel ld v Montagu
Azario v Robins
Ferne v Gorlitz
Pink v J A Sharwood & Co (to
be in List Oct. 20)

In re Sidney Ord & Co's Trade
Mark, No. 178,510 of 1891, and
In re Trade Marks Act, 1905

motion
Tindall v Goodhind
In re W T Edwards, dec Ed-
wards v Kew

Southgate v Mumford
Henderson v W Younger & Co ld
Alfred Mumford & Co v Grover

In re Mary Wilson, dec Eaden v
Eaden

Goldfoot v Welch
Edgar v Gibson
J Oberman & Co ld v Forbes

The Motor and General Invest-
ment Co v Associated Omnibus
Co ld

Jameson v Union Bank of Scot-
land

In re Robert Campbell, dec
Cooke v Campbell

Devonish v Stallwood
Cumberland v Haggie
Actiengesellschaft fur Anilin

Fabrikation in Berlin v Levin-
stein ld

J & A McFarlane ld v Hotton &
Co ld

Waring v Lipton ld
St. George's Court ld v Rosedale
Daniels v Trefusis

George Mann & Co ld and ors v
Furnival & Co ld

In the Matter of Trade Mark,
No 346,638, of Alice C Shreeve
and In re The Trade Marks Act,
1905

Jones v Nobbs
Maxse v Ronald
Preston v Same

Champneys v Same
Fisher v Same
Wardle Engineering Co ld v Cable

Accessories Co ld
Palmer v Kinglerlee
Bacon v Marsland

Lechmere v Norman
Swan v Pickering
Christian v Locke

Paul v Hobbs
Dayer Smith v Hadsley

Before Mr. Justice SARGANT.
Retained by Order.
Actions (with Witnesses).

From Mr. Justice SWINFEN EADY'S
List.

Natural Color Kinematograph
Co ld v Speer & Rodgers (s o
generally)

Booth v Williamson (s o generally)
Columbia Government v Colum-
bian Emerald Co ld (s o)

Pengelly-Manuell v Higgins
Carter v du Cros (s o generally)
Tattersall v Ravenscroft (s o
generally)

Hill v Gorton (s o generally)

Causes for Trial without Wit-
nesses and Adjourned Sum-
monses.

In re P Collings, a Solr, and In re
Taxation of Costs (s o)

In re Nicholas Kendall, an infant
(s o)

In re Letters Patent, No. 18,898
of 1904, and In re Patents and
Design Act, 1907 (s o leave to
amend)

In re Ernest Edward Street, dec
Vevers v Holman (s o liberty to
amend)

In re Woollett, dec Bate v Wool-
lett (s o until further order)

In re Henry Smith, dec Tingle
v Smith (s o generally)
In re Isaac Robinson Robinson v
Robinson (s o generally)

Smith v Australian Mining Gold
Recovery ld (s o generally)
Jenner v Jenner

In re The Solicitors' Act, 1843,
and In re Bartlett & Thornton,
Solrs

In re L B T Saunderson, dec Mul-
holland v Gore

In re Eyre, infants Guardian-
ship of Infants' Act, 1886 (in
camera) by order (s o generally)

In re Robert Abbey, dec Sims v
Abbey

In re The Midland Express ld
Pearson v The Company

In re D P McEuen, dec McEuen
v Phelps

Warrington v Thorpe
Miehle Printing Press and Manu-
facturing Co v Linotype
Machinery ld

In re Jesse's Trusts Davies v
Griffiths

In re John Giles, junr, dec Giles
v Giles

Before Mr. Justice ASTBURY.
Retained Witness Actions.

Williams v Williams and ors
Same v Same
The Sealomatics (Parent) Syndi-
cate ld v Pakeman

Further Considerations.
In re John Bassett, dec Cayley v
Loton Swan v Richards

In re T P Alder, dec Alder v
Alder

Causes for Trial Without Wit-
nesses and Adjourned
Summonses.

Rose v Sicilian Ry (s o to Nov 5).
In re Gough. Gough v Gough
(s o)

In re John Shaw, dec Shaw v
Knight

Seeley v Irving
In re Thomas Watson, dec Burt
v Watson

In re Hawkins, dec Hawkins v
Argent

In re J Jacobs' Trusts and In re
the Judicial Trustee Act, 1896

In re G Wilkinson, dec Green v
Ribchester

In re Nethercote, dec and In re
Wake, dec Beaumont v Wake

In re F Cusken's Trusts Cusken
v Cusken

In re W Cooke's Trusts Tarry v
Cook

In re Lindridge, dec Edwards v
Lindridge

In re E H Bayldon's Estate
Higlett v Bayldon

In re J W Abbott & Co ld Abbott
v The Company

Lehain v Bates
In re E L Miller, dec Cressey v
Miller

In re Fletcher's Trusts Helder v
Higgins

In re John Jacobs' Trusts and In
re The Trustee Act, 1896

In re Warrington, dec Legge v
Lodge

In re Desborough Estates and In
re Settled Land Acts

In re Duncan's Trusts Dashwood
v Teynham

In re J Craven's Estate Craven
v Craven

In re Tremelling, dec Tremelling
v Tremelling

In re Farmer-Atkinson Bennett
v Hall

In re G Tate, dec Williamson v
Gilpin

In re R Wiggan's Trusts Butt v
Wiggins

In re Pigott's Settlement Sawyer
v Balfour

In re Lindrea, dec Lindrea v
Fletcher

In re Booth's Estate Smee v
Attorney-Gen

In re W H North, dec Paton v
North

In re Elliott's Settlement Mitchell
v Elliott

In re Harper Plowman v Harper
In re The Trusts of New Coll.,
London and In re The Trustee
Act, 1893

In re Cherry's Trusts Robinson v
Trustees of Wesleyan Methodist
Chapel Purposes

In re Spencer, dec Wigram v
Spencer

In re The Howard Street Congre-
gational Chapel and In re The
Charitable Trusts Act

In re Hope's Settlement Aston v
Tarleton

In re Eades, dec Stubbs v Eades
In re J Gibbon, dec Lamb v
Chater

In re Millington, dec Public
Trustee v Dyson

In re Dorington's Estate Pol-
kinhorn v Hassard

In re M Prince, dec Prince v
Powell

In re Cooper, Bake, Roche and
Fettes, Solrs and In re taxn of
costs

In re Same and Same
In re Fewings Fewings v Few-
ings

In re Burman, dec Burman v
Burman

In re S E Sale, dec Nisbet v
Philp

In re A Coode, dec Coode v
Foster

In re Charles Lacey, dec Coulsell
v Gaster

Monk Breton Colliery Co v Barns-
ley Main Colliery Co

In re Jones' Settlement Jones v
Channer

In re Howard Howard v Howard
In re Henry Moul, dec In re The
Settled Acts

In re Murray, dec Levene v
Lotinga

Herbert v Herbert
In re James Wild, dec Wharmby
v Simpson

In re Fielding, dec Smallwood v
Fielding

Companies (Winding Up) and
Chancery Division.

Companies (Winding Up).
Petitions.

Gloria Copper Mines (Spain) ld
(petn of C B Toller—ordered on
April 11, 1911, to stand over
generally)

National Gymnasia and Entertain-
ments ld (petn of E M Cockell—
ordered on June 4, 1913, to stand
over generally)

Fred Smith ld (petn of W R
Frazier—s o from June 24, to
October 14, 1913)

F S F L Syndicate ld (petn of
C J Smith—s o from July 22 to
October 14, 1913)

F W Dunkley ld (petn of R Dyson
—s o from July 22 to October
14, 1913)

Takinta Oil Co ld (petn of R
Harman—s o from July 29 to
October 14, 1913)

Waterman & Spriggs (1913) ld
(petn of W Mumford—s o from
July 29 to October 14, 1913)

Slaters' Steam Bakery ld (petn of
the London Kneader Co)

"M" Tyres Patents Syndicate ld
(petn of Beldam Tyres ld)

Radium Ore Mines ld (petn of
E D Pryor and ors)

Chilian Eastern Central Ry Co ld
(petn of A Delimele)

Mercedes Daimler Motor Co ld
(petn of F.I.A.T. Motor Cab Co
ld)

New Colonial Co ld (petn of Brad-
bury & Hirsch)

F Jeanchen & Co ld (petn of
Metropole Syndicate ld)

Begel (Bauchi) Tin ld (petn of
J Dunn and anr)

Mitchell Brothers (London) ld
(petn of Russian Tyre and
Rubber Import Co ld)

Elmina Trading and Development
Co ld (petn of W H Mason)

Stannum Syndicate ld (petn of
Robarts Lubbock & Co)

Symons & Co ld (petn of Wm
O'Neill)

Oxev Fuel Co ld (petn of John
Stewart & Son (1912) ld)

Ernest Hawkins & Co ld (petn of
W M Gordon & Co)

John H Storey & Co ld (petn of
Premier Tyre Repairing Co ld)

Pall Mall Motor Works ld (petn of
A J Dew & Co)

Lawsha Amusement Syndicate ld
(petn of James Webster & Bro
ld)

South Manchurian Syndicate ld
(petn of Japan (Financial) Syn-
dicate ld)

Burrage & Tewson ld (petn of
Frederick Wright Boot and
Shoe Co ld)

Provincial Motor Cab Co ld (petn
of E A Hamlyn)

L Faulkner & Sons ld (petn of V
Faulkner and ors)

Patent Protection Assoc ld (petn
of D Sharp)

J B Johnston & Wilson ld (petn
of H A Goodall & Co ld)

Semely Co ld (petn of Daily News
ld)

Lancelot Raymond & Co ld (petn
of Spicer Brothers ld)

Harbours and Terminals Develop-
ments ld (petn of R Brooks)

Atherfield (Hevea) Rubber Estates
ld (petn of H W S Karr and
ors)

Pethick Dix & Co ld (petn of
Taylor & Parsons ld)

Cann & Partners ld (petn of A
Palmer & Co)

Chancery Division.

Petitions (to Confirm Reduction of
Capital).

S H Bousfield & Co ld and reduced
(ordered on June 10th, 1913, to
stand over generally)

Thomas Poulter & Sons ld and
reduced

Java United Plantations ld and
reduced

Rubber and Tea Investors Trust
ld and reduced

Petitions (to sanction Scheme of
Arrangement).

Doecham Gloves ld (s o for aet 45
to be complied with)

London and Provincial Dairy Co
ld (petn of the Company)

Companies (Winding Up).

Petition (to sanction Scheme of
Arrangement and confirm Re-
duction of Capital).

J & T H Wallis ld and reduced
(petn of Company and Liqui-
dator—s o from July 29th to
October 14th, 1913)

CHANCERY DIVISION.

Petition (to confirm alteration to
Memo. of Association).

City of Ely Gas Co ld

Companies (Winding Up).

Motion.

Stamford, Spalding and Boston
Banking Co ld (to discharge
order, dated May 6, 1912—part
heard—ordered on May 23, 1912,
to stand over generally)

Companies (Winding Up) and
Chancery Division.

Court Summonses.

Egyptian Estates ld (for removal
of "saisies" on debts—ordered
on March 7, 1911, to stand over
generally)

National Provincial Insee Corpn
ld (for account, &c.—ordered on
February 25, 1913, to stand
over generally)

John Halpin ld (to vary list of
contributories)

English and Scottish American
Mortgage Co ld (as to contin-
gent claims)

Pall Mall Land and Finance Corpn
(to vary list of contributories—
ex parte Charlesworth and anr)

Same (for leave to make a call)

Republic of Bolivia Exploration
Syndicate ld (misfeasance—with
witnesses)

Pacaya Rubber and Produce Co
ld (to vary list of contributories
—with witnesses)

J M Bain & Co ld (to vary list
of contributories)

Palladium Brighton ld (misfeas-
ance)

Gas Economising and Improved
Light Syndicate ld

Lamplough & Son ld

Jackson v Lamplough & Son ld
and anr (sanction sale)

Radium Ore Mines ld (leave to
examine Company's property)

In the Matter of a Solicitor Expte The Law Soc

Mash v Darley

Wolfenden v Mason

Miller v Field

The King v Astor & ors

The King v Madge & anr

The King v Shackles

The King v Ellis, Esq & anr, Jj, &c

Lambert v Rowe

Atkins v Agar

Hale v Morris & Sons

The King v Sindall, Esq & anr, Jj, &c

Henderson, Craig & Co v Dixon & Son

Wills & Sons v McSherry & ors

The King v Judge Mellor & Royal London, &c Insee Co

Owner v Beehive Spinning Co ld

Jenkins v Lewis

Holliday & Greenwood ld v District Surveyors' Assoc (Incorporated)

& anr

Webster v Terry

The King v Goodenough & anr

Holmes v Pipers ld

The King v Harrison

The King v Mercer

Huish v Justices of Liverpool

Lewis v Harris

London County Council v St Botolph Churchwardens

The King v Mayor, &c of Swansea

The King v Hendon U D C

The King v Thomas, Esq & anr, Jj, &c and Williams

Bunt v Kent

Cooper v Swift

Scott & anr v Director of Public Prosecutions

Anderson v Butcher

The King v Bloomsbury Income Tax Commrs

Oakey v Jackson

Newell v King & anr

Morgan v Kenyon & anr

Jeffery & ors v Binks

Waters v Braithwaite

Radford v Williams

Minty v Glew

Vickerson v Crowe

Same v Pell

Finchley U D C v Blyton

Lees U D C v Hunter and anr

Grimble & Co ld v Preston

London County Council v Leyson

Robinson v Morewood

The King v Islington Assessment Committee

North Staffordshire Ry Co v Waters

The King v Brown

Smith v Thetford Union

The King v Williams, Esq and ors, Jj

The King v Same

The King v Same

Hendon Paper Works Co v Sunderland Union and ors

In the Matter of a Solicitor Expte the Law Soc

Same v Same

The King v Governor of Brixton Prison (ex parte Servini)

CIVIL PAPER.

For Argument.

Northumberland County Council and the Mayor, &c of Newcastle-upon-

Tyne v the Mayor, &c of Tynemouth

London United Tramways ld v London County Council

H Autran ld v Fratelli Foti fu Gaetano

Werner v Mauch

Smith v Craig County Court

Hodgson v Cory Bros & Co ld

London and Provinces Discount Co ld v Jones (Standard Developments
ld, clmts)

Tofts v Pearl Life Assce Co ld

Jones v United Counties Bank ld

Schofield & Co v Surie & Sons

Thomas v Carr

Goldhawk Mutual Benefit Building Soc v Carter

Burgess v Samuels

Poulton v Moore and ors

Steel v Christenson

Cross and anr v Leaney

Reichardt v Shard

Swain v Barton

Mountier v Army and Navy Auxiliary Supply Co ld

Poulton v Moore and ors

Peterborough Coal Consumers' Co ld v Marquis and Marchioness of

Huntley

McLean v L B and S C Ry Co

Financial Assisting Soc ld v Turner (E Turner, clmt)

Hall v Zimmermann & Co

Hammond Bros & Champness ld v Jackson

KING'S BENCH DIVISION.

MICHAELMAS SITTINGS, 1913.

CROWN PAPER.

For Argument.

The King v Islington Borough Council

Staveley Coal & Iron Co ld v Midland Ry Co

The King v Commrs of Inland Revenue

London County Council v Corporation of the Hall of Arts and Sciences

Associated Newspapers ld & ors v Mayor, &c of City of London

Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons v Kennard

Haxby v Wood Advertising Agency & Davis

Smith v Maxfield & Co

Oldfield v Ennion

Gt Western & Metropolitan Ry Cos v Kensington Assessment Committee

Same v Hammersmith Assessment Committee

Williams v Gosden

Poole v Stokes

Appleyard v Baugham

The King v Hon John de Grey & Moorhouse

Metford & ors v Edwards

Baynham & ors v Same

The King v Simpson, Esq & ors, Jj, &c

Wills v Great Western Ry Co
Walker and anr v Canal Co ld
Alexander v Grain Growers' Export Co, Winnipeg
Procter & Co v Same
Schwartz v Hawksbee
Brewer v Truman, Hanbury, Buxton and Co
Catchpole v Minster
Silver v Pearse
Clarke v Bates
Roberts v Stuart and Wife
Jones v Same
Trollope & Colls ld v Singer
Simes v Quin and Axtens
Neville and anr v Hodgkinson
Merrick v Hawkins & Co ld
Myer & Co and anr v Hodgkinson
Kettle v Coytraben Park Colliery Co ld
Cox & Son v Starley
Myers v Mayor, &c of Bradford
Neal and anr v Met Ry Co and ors
In the matter of S and F Aspinall ld Lister v Lees
MacGregor v Clamp and Son
Riebold v Williams
Higginson v Blackwell Colliery Co
Pitchford v Same
Prevost v Gruber
Gilford v Capon
Oetzmann & Co v Winstanley & ors
Hinchliffe & ors v Ramsden
Lloyd & Sons v Danby (C E Danby, Clmt)
Redmile v Fleming & anr
Morris v Bloch & ors
Kemp v Vanden Bergh & anr
Morris v Bloch & ors
Hearts of Oak, &c Assce Co v Walton
Shine v Pegrum

English v Goodrich
Benjamin v Carter, Paterson & Co
Turner v Metropolitan Ry Co
Miller v White
Orr v Northern Industrial Syndicate
Hancock & Co v Cadogan & ors
Same v Quirk
Same v Davies
Orchard v King
Lacome v British Legal United Provident Assoc ld
Pick v Dudley Co-operative Soc
Bowyer & Baker v Smith (Knox & anr, Clmts)
Fisher v Palmer (Maxwell, Garnishee)
London & Counties Assets Co v Brighton, &c Palace ld
Jays ld v Browne
Robinson v Neville
Lefever v Pethick, Dix & Co ors
Birmingham Private Telephone, &c Co v Terry & Sons
Chambers v Landseer
Holmstead v Watson
Heater & anr v Chambers
May v May
Maw & ors v Gilford & ors
Hancock & Co ld v Howells & anr
Buckland v Caeraw, &c Co-operative Soc
Parry & ors v Wynnstay Collieries
Thomas & ors v Same
Evans & ors v Same
Warner Engineering Co v Brennan & anr
Miller & Co v Dunn & Co
Sapsford v Furze
Crew & Partners v Wehl
Arnold v Jeffreys
Norman v G W Ry Co
Goodwyn v White
Allen v West

Circuits of the Judges.

The following Judges will remain in Town: THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE OF ENGLAND, RIDLEY, J., CHANNELL, 'J., A. T. LAWRENCE J., PICKFORD, J., LUSH, J., and ATKIN, J., during the whole of the Circuits; the other Judges till their respective Commission Days.

AUTUMN ASSIZES, 1913.	N. EASTERN.	WESTERN.	S. EASTERN.	OXFORD.	MIDLAND.	N. & S. WALES.	NORTHERN.
Commission Days.	Darling, J. (1) Scrutton, J. (2)	Phillimore, J. (1) Horridge, J. (2)	Bray, J. (1) Bucknill, J. (2)	Lord Coleridge, J.	Rowlatt, J.	Banks, J.	Avory, J. (1) Baillache, J. (2)
Monday, Oct. 13	Dates not yet fixed.	Devises	Cambridge	Reading	Aylesbury	Carnarvon	
Wednesday " 15					Ruthin	Ruthin	
Thursday " 16		Dorchester	Norwich	Oxford	Bedford		
Friday " 17					Northampton	Chester	Carlisle
Saturday " 18		Wells	B. S. Edmunds	Worcester	Leicester	(Olv. & Crim.)	
Tuesday " 21					Lincoln		Lancaster
Wednesday " 22		Bodmin		Gloucester			
Thursday " 23					Nottingham		
Friday " 24					Derby		
Saturday " 25		Exeter		Shrewsbury	Warwick		
Sunday " 26		Civil Nov. 3		Stafford			
Monday " 27		Winchester					
Tuesday " 28							
Wednesday " 29							
Thursday " 30							
Friday " 31							
Saturday, Nov. 1							
Sunday, Nov. 2							
Monday, Nov. 3							
Tuesday, Nov. 4							
Wednesday, Nov. 5							
Thursday, Nov. 6							
Friday, Nov. 7							
Saturday, Nov. 8							
Sunday, Nov. 9							
Monday, Nov. 10							
Tuesday, Nov. 11							
Wednesday, Nov. 12							
Thursday, Nov. 13							
Friday, Nov. 14							
Saturday, Nov. 15							
Sunday, Nov. 16							
Monday, Nov. 17							
Tuesday, Nov. 18							
Wednesday, Nov. 19							
Thursday, Nov. 20							
Friday, Nov. 21							
Saturday, Nov. 22							
Sunday, Nov. 23							
Monday, Nov. 24							
Tuesday, Nov. 25							
Wednesday, Nov. 26							
Thursday, Nov. 27							
Friday, Nov. 28							
Saturday, Nov. 29							
Sunday, Nov. 30							
Monday, Dec. 1							
Tuesday, Dec. 2							
Wednesday, Dec. 3							
Thursday, Dec. 4							
Friday, Dec. 5							
Saturday, Dec. 6							
Sunday, Dec. 7							
Monday, Dec. 8							
Tuesday, Dec. 9							
Wednesday, Dec. 10							
Thursday, Dec. 11							
Friday, Dec. 12							
Saturday, Dec. 13							
Sunday, Dec. 14							
Monday, Dec. 15							
Tuesday, Dec. 16							
Wednesday, Dec. 17							
Thursday, Dec. 18							
Friday, Dec. 19							
Saturday, Dec. 20							
Sunday, Dec. 21							
Monday, Dec. 22							
Tuesday, Dec. 23							
Wednesday, Dec. 24							
Thursday, Dec. 25							
Friday, Dec. 26							
Saturday, Dec. 27							
Sunday, Dec. 28							
Monday, Dec. 29							
Tuesday, Dec. 30							
Wednesday, Dec. 31							
Thursday, Jan. 1							
Friday, Jan. 2							
Saturday, Jan. 3							
Sunday, Jan. 4							
Monday, Jan. 5							
Tuesday, Jan. 6							
Wednesday, Jan. 7							
Thursday, Jan. 8							
Friday, Jan. 9							
Saturday, Jan. 10							
Sunday, Jan. 11							
Monday, Jan. 12							
Tuesday, Jan. 13							
Wednesday, Jan. 14							
Thursday, Jan. 15							
Friday, Jan. 16							
Saturday, Jan. 17							
Sunday, Jan. 18							
Monday, Jan. 19							
Tuesday, Jan. 20							
Wednesday, Jan. 21							
Thursday, Jan. 22							
Friday, Jan. 23							
Saturday, Jan. 24							
Sunday, Jan. 25							
Monday, Jan. 26							
Tuesday, Jan. 27							
Wednesday, Jan. 28							
Thursday, Jan. 29							
Friday, Jan. 30							
Saturday, Jan. 31							
Sunday, Feb. 1							
Monday, Feb. 2							
Tuesday, Feb. 3							
Wednesday, Feb. 4							
Thursday, Feb. 5							
Friday, Feb. 6							
Saturday, Feb. 7							
Sunday, Feb. 8							
Monday, Feb. 9							
Tuesday, Feb. 10							
Wednesday, Feb. 11							
Thursday, Feb. 12							
Friday, Feb. 13							
Saturday, Feb. 14							
Sunday, Feb. 15							
Monday, Feb. 16							
Tuesday, Feb. 17							
Wednesday, Feb. 18							
Thursday, Feb. 19							
Friday, Feb. 20							
Saturday, Feb. 21							
Sunday, Feb. 22							
Monday, Feb. 23							
Tuesday, Feb. 24							
Wednesday, Feb. 25							
Thursday, Feb. 26							
Friday, Feb. 27							
Saturday, Feb. 28							
Sunday, Feb. 29							
Monday, Feb. 30							
Tuesday, Mar. 1							
Wednesday, Mar. 2							
Thursday, Mar. 3							
Friday, Mar. 4							
Saturday, Mar. 5							
Sunday, Mar. 6							
Monday, Mar. 7							
Tuesday, Mar. 8							
Wednesday, Mar. 9							
Thursday, Mar. 10							
Friday, Mar. 11							
Saturday, Mar. 12							
Sunday, Mar. 13							
Monday, Mar. 14							
Tuesday, Mar. 15							
Wednesday, Mar. 16							
Thursday, Mar. 17							
Friday, Mar. 18							
Saturday, Mar. 19							
Sunday, Mar. 20							
Monday, Mar. 21							
Tuesday, Mar. 22							
Wednesday, Mar. 23							
Thursday, Mar. 24							
Friday, Mar. 25							
Saturday, Mar. 26							
Sunday, Mar. 27							
Monday, Mar. 28							
Tuesday, Mar. 29							
Wednesday, Mar. 30							
Thursday, Mar. 31							
Friday, Apr. 1							
Saturday, Apr. 2							
Sunday, Apr. 3							
Monday, Apr. 4							
Tuesday, Apr. 5							
Wednesday, Apr. 6							
Thursday, Apr. 7							
Friday, Apr. 8							
Saturday, Apr. 9							
Sunday, Apr. 10							
Monday, Apr. 11							
Tuesday, Apr. 12							
Wednesday, Apr. 13							
Thursday, Apr. 14							
Friday, Apr. 15							
Saturday, Apr. 16							
Sunday, Apr. 17							
Monday, Apr. 18							
Tuesday, Apr. 19							
Wednesday, Apr. 20							
Thursday, Apr. 21							
Friday, Apr. 22							
Saturday, Apr. 23							
Sunday, Apr. 24							
Monday, Apr. 25							
Tuesday, Apr. 26							
Wednesday, Apr. 27							
Thursday, Apr. 28							
Friday, Apr. 29							
Saturday, Apr. 30							
Sunday, May 1							
Monday, May 2							
Tuesday, May 3							
Wednesday, May 4							
Thursday, May 5							
Friday, May 6							
Saturday, May 7							
Sunday, May 8							
Monday, May 9							
Tuesday, May 10							
Wednesday, May 11							
Thursday, May 12							
Friday, May 13							
Saturday, May 14							
Sunday, May 15							
Monday, May 16							
Tuesday, May 17							
Wednesday, May 18							
Thursday, May 19							
Friday, May 20							
Saturday, May 21							
Sunday, May 22							
Monday, May 23							
Tuesday, May 24							
Wednesday, May 25							
Thursday, May 26							
Friday, May 27							
Saturday, May 28							
Sunday, May 29							
Monday, May 30							
Tuesday, May 31							
Wednesday, Jun. 1							
Thursday, Jun. 2							
Friday, Jun. 3							
Saturday, Jun. 4							
Sunday, Jun. 5							
Monday, Jun. 6							
Tuesday, Jun. 7							
Wednesday, Jun. 8							
Thursday, Jun. 9							
Friday, Jun. 10							
Saturday, Jun. 11							
Sunday, Jun. 12							
Monday, Jun. 13							
Tuesday, Jun. 14							
Wednesday, Jun. 15							
Thursday, Jun. 16							
Friday, Jun. 17							
Saturday, Jun. 18							
Sunday, Jun. 19							
Monday, Jun. 20							
Tuesday, Jun. 21							
Wednesday, Jun. 22							
Thursday, Jun. 23							
Friday, Jun. 24							
Saturday, Jun. 25							
Sunday, Jun. 26							
Monday, Jun. 27							
Tuesday, Jun. 28							
Wednesday, Jun. 29							
Thursday, Jun. 30							
Friday, Jul. 1							
Saturday, Jul. 2							
Sunday, Jul. 3							
Monday, Jul. 4							
Tuesday, Jul. 5							
Wednesday, Jul. 6							
Thursday, Jul. 7							
Friday, Jul. 8							
Saturday, Jul. 9							
Sunday, Jul. 10							
Monday, Jul. 11							
Tuesday, Jul. 12							
Wednesday, Jul. 13							
Thursday, Jul. 14							
Friday, Jul. 15							
Saturday, Jul. 16							
Sunday, Jul. 17							
Monday, Jul. 18							
Tuesday, Jul. 19							
Wednesday, Jul. 20							
Thursday, Jul. 21							
Friday, Jul. 22							
Saturday, Jul. 23							
Sunday, Jul. 24							
Monday, Jul. 25							
Tuesday, Jul. 26							
Wednesday, Jul. 27							
Thursday, Jul. 28							
Friday, Jul. 29							
Saturday, Jul. 30							
Sunday, Jul. 31							
Monday, Aug. 1							
Tuesday, Aug. 2							
Wednesday, Aug. 3							
Thursday, Aug. 4							
Friday, Aug. 5							
Saturday, Aug. 6							
Sunday, Aug. 7							
Monday, Aug. 8							
Tuesday, Aug. 9							
Wednesday, Aug. 10							
Thursday, Aug. 11							
Friday, Aug. 12							
Saturday, Aug. 13							
Sunday, Aug. 14							

Resolutions for Winding-up Voluntarily.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Oct. 3.

CYGNUS MOTORS, LTD.
COLONY, LTD.
J. B. JOHNSON & WILSON, LTD.
WALTHAMSTOW GRAND CENTRAL CINEMA, LTD.
STIRLING GARAGE (HOVE) LTD.
DOCK SWAIN TYRE AND RUBBER CO, LTD.
MERCERS EXPRESS CO, LTD.
GARDENERS (OF GLOSSOP), LTD.
MARSHALL W. S. FRANK, LTD.
TOWNHOUSE WINE CO, LTD.
PAGE, DIBBY & CO, LTD.
THE BRITISH DUPLEX MOTOR ENGINE SYNDICATE, LTD.
THE GREAT COGGESHALL GAS CO, LTD.
AUTOFUME SYNDICATE, LTD.
DORRING GARAGE CO, LTD.
PINNOCKS STORES AND AGENCY, LTD.
THE MUANA DEVELOPMENT SYNDICATE, LTD.
BOLTON SOHO MILL CO, LTD.
T. & T. H. PASTING & CO, LTD.
MILGROVE, HOULSTON & CO, LTD.

The Property Mart.

Forthcoming Auction Sales.

October 14.—Messrs. HAMPTON & SONS, at the Mart: Leasehold Property, Residences (see advertisement, back page, Sept. 27, and page 31, Oct. 4).
Oct. 16.—Messrs. H. E. FOSTER & CHAPFIELD, at the Mart, at 2: Reversions, Policies, Shares and Debentures (see advertisement, back page, this week).
October 17.—Messrs. FULLER, HOSSEY, SONS & CASSELL, at the Mart, at 2: Freehold Investments (see advertisement, back page, this week).
October 22.—Messrs. EDWIN FOX, BOUSFIELD, BURNETT & BADDELEY, at the Mart, at 2: Freehold Ground Rents (see advertisement, back page, this week).
October —.—Messrs. MILLAR, BOW & CO., at Taunton: Freehold Estates (see advertisement, back page, Sept. 37).

Creditors' Notices.

Under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Oct. 3.

BELL, FREDERIC WILBERFORCE, Birkd & Awe, Bolton ANonha OneOqst Rac,
BENGOUGH, JOHN CHARLES, Southampton Nov 25 Meade & Co, Bristol
BIRNING, JOSEPH, Calcutta, India, Exchange Broker Nov 10 Loughborough & Co
Austin Friars
BOOTH, ARTHUR, Longton, Tailor Oct 27 Graham, Longt n
BOOTH, THOMAS, Conistrough, Yorks, Timber Merchant Nov 4 Allen, Doncaster
BRADY, ANTHONY NICHOLAS, Albany, U.S.A. Nov 6 Hood, 86, Strand
CHADWICK, WILLIAM, Higher Ardwick, Manchester Nov 18 Eaton, Manchester
COLES, WILLIAM HENRY, Plymouth, Builder Oct 30 Shelly & Johns, Plymouth
DAVIDSON, R. VEVEY, Switzerland Nov 8 Wainwright & Co, Church ct, Clement's In
DAWSON, WILLIAM GEORGE, Rochester, Surrey Oct 31 Haalewood & Co, Temple
chambers
DOUGLASS, WILLIAM TREGARTHEN, Airie gdn., Kensington, Civil Engineer Nov 1
Hores & Co, Lincoln's Inn fields
FLETCHER, BERTHA ISABELLA, North Berwick Nov 15 Nicholson & Co, Queen Anne's
gate
GAUSSEN, ALICIA FENTON, Lyndhurst, Hants Nov 8 Wainwright & Co, Church ct,
Clement's In
GRAINGER, MARY, Liverpool Nov 6 Evans & Co, Liverpool
GREY-EDWARDS, HENRY, Bangor Nov 1 Jones, Bangor
GRUNDY, JOHN WILLIAM, Higher Boughton, nr Manchester Nov 15 Addleshaw & Co,
Manchester
HALL LOUISA MARGARET, Clifton, nr Bristol Nov 7 Leighton & Savory, Clements inn
HARRIS, HERBERT, Johannesburg, Transvaal, Confectioner Nov 15 Twisden & Co,
Gray's Inn sq
HARWIE, RICHARD, Boughton, Norfolk Nov 30 Pratt, Sutton, Surrey
KENNESY, EDWARD RUSSELL, Eerkawell, Warwick, Surgeon Oct 31 O'Connor, Birming-
ham
HODGSON, ANN, Whitehaven Oct 27 Thompson, Whitehaven
HOLLANS, WILLIAM ERNEST, Newsg, Lincoln's inn Nov 3 Trower & Co, New sq
HUDSON, SAM, Bradford, Licensed Victualler Oct 18 Hammond, Bradford
JACKSON, PHILIP WELLS, Ashtey av, Cricklewood, Military Outfitter Dec 1 Richardson
& Co, Golden sq, Regent st

LEWY, BENJAMIN HENRY, Sydney, New South Wales Nov 3 Light & Fulton, Laurence
Pounney hill
MACDONALD, DONALD, New Brighton Nov 5 Field & Co, Liverpool
MACNEIL, LOUISA LUCIA, Tunbridge Wells Oct 31 Eggar & Co, Brighton
MAJOR, WILLIAM, Folkestone Nov 18 Hall, Folkestone
MAXTEDALE, REBECCA, Eddington Nov 14 Cooper & Sons, Manchester
MAXTED, EMILY, Windermere, Westmorland Nov 3 Maxted & Co, Lancaster
MILLER, JAMES, Blackpool, Contractor Nov 5 Haworth, Blackburn
NEUBRONNER, ANGELIQUE MARIE, Haskerton, Suffolk Nov 1 Tatham & Louaads
Old Broad st
NEVILLE, SAMUEL, Brentford, Md lxx Oct 31 Woodbridge & Sons, Brentford
PALMER, WILLIAM THOMAS, Kettering, Restaurant Proprietor Oct 31 Bul
Kettering
PARROTTER, JOHN WILLIAM, Chaddesley, Corbett, Worcester Nov 5 Bannister
Stourbridge
QUIRKE, MICHAEL, Golborne, Lancs, Catholic Priest Oct 24 O'Hare, Liverpool
REDMAN, ALFRED, Liscard, Chester Nov 7 Cleaver & Co, Liverpool
RIGHTON, EMMA MARY, Disraeli rd, Putney Nov 6 Haigh & Haigh, Coleman st
ROBINSON, MARY ANN, Albert Park, Victoria, Australia Oct 22 Cohen & Co, Audrey
House, Ely pl
SAYAGE, MARY ANN, Lincoln Oct 30 Hebb & Sills, Lincoln
STARNS, JAMES, Ilford, Essex Nov 5 Wadson & Malleson, Devonshire sq
WHENMAN, KATIE ELIZABETH, Hampton Wick, Middx Nov 12 Pearce & Sons, West
smithfield
WILD, WILLIAM, Shw, Lancs Oct 31 Taylor, Manchester
WILLIS, JOHN THOMAS, Coundon Grange, Durham, Colliery Timekeeper Nov 16 Gill-
mour, Hartogate

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Oct. 7.

AGATE, EDWARD EVERSHED, Worthing Nov 3 G & M Goodman, St Helen's pl
BAKER, RICHARD, Chardmore rd, Upper Clapton, Tailor Nov 14 Campton, Arthur st
BASTIN, EDWARD JOHN, All Saints rd, Notting Hill, Bookseller Nov 11 Champness,
& Co, 14, Serjeant's inn
BLAKLEY, LOUISA HOFFMAN, Bournemouth Nov 6 Lee & Co, Queen Victoria st
BROADBENT, ELIZA, Manchester Nov 18 J & E Whitworth, Manchester
BROADBENT, JOHN, Manchester, Surgeon Nov 18 J & E Whitworth, Manchester
BROOK, JOHN FREDERICK, Barkisland, nr Halifax Farmer Nov 5 Dey, Halifax
BROOKS, WALTER, Daryhulme, Joiner Nov 7 Stubbs & Co, Manchester
BURNS, WILLIAM, Bigbury on Sea, nr Kingsbridge, Devon, Merchant Nov 10 Thomp-
son & Co, 2, East India av
CECIL, THE HON ARTHUR, Lymington, Hants Nov 24 Nicholson & Co, 46, Queen Anne's
gt
CLARKE, MARY, Liphook, Hants Nov 15 Capron & Co, Savile pl, Conduit st
COLLINS, JAMES TERTIUS, Edgbaston, Birmingham, JP Nov 12 Johnson & Co
Birmingham
COOPER, ELIZABETH, Sheffield Oct 31 Howe & Co, Shefeld
DEARLEY, MARY ANN, Halifax Nov 23 Wilkinson, Halifax
D'KOR, AUGUSTUS FREDERICK PHILLIPS, Rosedale rd, Putney Nov 15 Sloper &
Co, Putney hill
DUNCAN, LAWRENCE, St Albans, Herts Nov 7 Wootton & Son, London Wall
ELLIOTT, GEORGE FREDERICK, Farnham, Surrey Oct 25 Hollett & Co, Farnham
ELLIS, HON EVELYN HENRY, Portland pl Dec 25 Cutler & Allingham, Duk: st, St
James's
EVANS, DAVID HENRY, Liverpool Nov 15 Collins & Co, Liverpool
GARROD, HERBERT JAMES, Cheveley, Cambridge, Estate Agent Nov 10 D'Alhoni &
Ellis, Newmarket
GILES, Rt Rev WILLIAM, Rome, Italy Nov 3 Slaughter & Colgrave, Arundel st, Strand
GOODCHILD, ARTHUR PHILLIP, Stafford Nov 8 Rex & Co, Stafford
GOURAUD, BAYARD, Mesrut, India Nov 4 Slaughter & Colgrave, Arundel st, Strand
GROVES, RICHARD, Dunster, Somerset, Wesleyan Minister Nov 8 Joyce & Co, Mine-
head
HENRY, ELLEN, South Shore, Blackpool Nov 13 Chapman & Co, Manchester
HULBERT, JOHN ATTWOOD, Southampton Nov 10 Nye & Clewer, Brighton
LAURIE, AUGUSTUS JOHN, Havant, Hants, Staff Surgeon Royal Navy Nov 18 Robinson
& Suckling, Southsea
LOYD, RICHARD DOPPA, Addison cres Nov 5 Rundle & Hobrow, Basinghall st
LOFT, CATHERINE, Sutton Coldfield, nr Birmingham Nov 12 Johnson & Co, Bir-
mingham
MELLORE, BETTY, Royton, Lancs Nov 8 Brierley, Oldham
MOORE, ELLEN, Gloucester ter, Hyde Park Nov 11 Rivington & Son, Fenchurch
bldgs
MOORE, ROSINA SARAH, Harker st, Chelsea Oct 27 Conway, Rochester row, West-
minster
OXLEY, ARTHUR, Bowdon, Chester Nov 5 Parkinson & Co, Manchester
OXLEY, HARRIETT, Altrincham Nov 5 Parkinson & Co, Manchester
POLO, LOUIS DE, Liverpool, Carpenter Oct 31 Lynskey & Son, Liverpool
PRINGLE, ELIZA INEZ, Rutland gate, Kn ghtsbridge Nov 10 Bucknill & Co, Raymond
bldgs
RAWLINSON, Major GEORGE BROOKE MILLERS, Grange over Sands, Lancs Nov 20
Milne, Kendal
RAWLINSON, HENRY, St Helena, Lancs Nov 14 Oppenheim & Sons, St Helena
SAMUEL-YATES, ALBERT HENRY, JP, Liverpool, Oil and Colour Merchant Oct 31 Barrell
& Co, Liverpool
SARGANT, STEPHEN SMITH, Shelton, Stoke on Trent, Grocer Oct 20 Moxon, Hanley
SHEPHERD, GEORGE, St John's, Worcester Nov 10 Roberts, Clebury Mortimer,
Salop

THE LICENSES INSURANCE CORPORATION AND GUARANTEE FUND, LIMITED,

24, MOORGATE STREET, LONDON, E.C.

ESTABLISHED IN 1890.

LICENSES INSURANCE.

SPECIALISTS IN ALL LICENSING MATTERS.

Upwards of 750 Appeals to Quarter Sessions have been conducted under the direction and supervision of the Corporation.
Suitable Clauses for insertion in Leases or Mortgages of Licensed Property, Settled by Counsel, will be sent on application.

POOLING INSURANCE.

The Corporation also insures risks in connection with FIRE, CONSEQUENTIAL LOSS, BURGLARY, WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION, FIDELITY GUARANTEE, THIRD PARTY, &c., under a perfected Profit-sharing system.

APPLY FOR PROSPECTUS.

SKAIPH, ARTHUR, Harnocks, Sussex Nov 14 Ashbridge, Fenchurch st
SKENE, JANE, Gateshead Nov 2 Dickinson & Co. Newcastle upon Tyne
SWINGLHURST, JOHN, Gamston, Nottingham, Wheelwright Nov 18 Mee & Co, Retford
TAYLOR, ELIZABETH, Royton, Lancs Oct 31 Holroyd, Oldham
TOMPKINS, JOHN CHARLES, York ter, Regent's Park Nov 24 Nicholson & Co, Queen Anne's grt
TOLAND, FRANCIS, Harton st, Deptford Nov 8 Myson & Co, Gresham st
TURNER, ALICE, Waterloo, Lancs Nov 17 Alsop & Co, Liverpool
WAITE, MARGARET, Burghy Sands, Cumberland Nov 15 Beckton, Carlisle

WATTS, HUGH, Chapetow Nov 19 Woodhouse & Davidson, Lime st
WHATELEY, HENRY LAURENCE, Eaton sq Nov 24 Nicholson & Co, Queen Anne's grt
WHITLOCK, HARRIOTT, Silverstone, Northampton Nov 7 Groves, Towsester
WHITTICK, OWEN STEPHEN, Bix, Oxford, Farmer Oct 30 Cooper & Co, Henley on Thames
WILLIAMS, LEWIS, Hay, Brecon, Cooper Nov 7 Wallis, Hereford
WOOD, WALTER, Blyth, Registrar of Births, Deaths, and Marriages Nov 7 Peebles, North Shields
WOODWARD, LEONARD MEDLICOTT, Moseley, Birmingham, Merchant Nov 10 Pincet & Co, Birmingham

Bankruptcy Notices.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Oct. 3.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

BRANDENBURG, FREDERICK ADOLPH, Newcastle upon Tyne, Wholesale Provision Merchant High Court Pet Aug 28 Ord Sept 29
BROOKES, ALFRED JOHN, Fulham rd, Cycle Dealer High Court Pet Sept 29 Ord Sept 29
CROOK, TOM EVL, Hungerford, Licensed Victualler Newbury Pet Sept 30 Ord Sept 30
DANIEL, H A HOOD, Union ct, Old Broad st High Court Pet Sept 1 Ord Sept 30
DAVIES, EDWARD, Loug or, Glam, Builder Carmarthen Pet Sept 29 Ord Sept 30
FORD, JOSEPH JAMES, His Majesty's Prison, Derby, Auctioneer Stockport Pet Sept 29 Ord Sept 29
GREGOIRE, ALBERT VICTOR, Broadstairs, Kent, Schoolmaster Canterbury Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 27
GROOM, WILLIAM, Whitlington, nr Oswestry, Under Gamekeeper Wrexham Pet Sept 30 Ord Sept 30
HOTHERSALL, WILLIAM, Gorton, Manchester, Foreman Moulder Manchester Pet Sept 16 Ord Sept 29
ISAACSON, ISAAC, and MORRIS ISAACSON, Brunswick pl, City rd, Trunk Manufacturers High Court Pet Oct 1 Ord Oct 1
JURY, OSBORN, Leamington, Car Proprietor Warwick Pet Sept 30 Ord Sept 30
KOSBICK, JOSEPH, Jarrow, Durham, Chemist Newcastle upon Tyne Pet Sept 4 Ord Sept 29
LATHAM, FRED, Northwich, Cheshire, Butcher Nantwich Pet Sept 2 Ord Sept 29
MACRAT, A, Bourne End, Bucks Wandsworth Pet July 14 Ord Aug 21
MCGREGOR, DONALD, and ROBERT EDWARD MCGREGOR, Tottenham Court rd, Boot and Shoe Retailer High Court Pet Oct 2 Ord Oct 2
MELLOR, WILLIAM HENRY, Urmston, Lancs, Brickmaker Salford Pet Aug 9 Ord Sept 29
ODDY, BENJAMIN JOSEPH, Bradford, Taxi Cab Proprietor Bradford Pet Oct 1 Ord Oct 1
PECKHAM, WILLIAM JAMES, Southsea, Hants, Cycle Agent Portsmouth Pet Aug 27 Ord Sept 29
READ, JAMES, Norwich, Fruit Merchant Norwich Pet Oct 1 Ord Oct 1
RUSHBY, ALFRED, Great Grimsby, Tobaccoists' Traveller Great Grimsby Pet Oct 1 Ord Oct 1
SEYMOUR, CLAUDE OSMAN, Winscombe, Somerset, Coal Merchant Wells Pet Oct 1 Ord Oct 1
SIMPSON, ARTHUR DEWYN, Great Grimsby, Fish Merchant Great Grimsby Pet Sept 29 Ord Sept 29
SLACK, HENRY ALBERT, Romford, Essex, Journalist Chelmsford Pet Sept 30 Ord Sept 30
THOMAS, HUGH JOHN, Trefriw, Carnarvonshire, Miner Portmadoc Pet Sept 30 Ord Sept 30
VICK, HOWARD, ARTHUR ASHWORTH, WILLIAM PEARCE, FRED ASHWORTH, and LEONARD INGRAM, Salford, General Printers Salford Pet Sept 11 Ord Sept 29
WADE, WILLIAM HENRY, Netherfield, Notts, Grocer Nottingham Pet Oct 1 Ord Oct 1
WEINBAUM, ISAAC MYER, New Union st, Moorfields, Soft Goods Merchant High Court Pet Sept 29 Ord Sept 29
WHITE, HAROLD GOODENOUGH and E W WHITE, Sketty Swansea Builders Swansea Pet Aug 29 Ord Oct 1
WILLET, GEORGE HAGGER, Saffron Walden, Essex, Butcher Cambridge Pet Sept 17 Ord Oct 1

RECEIVING ORDERS RESCINDED AND PETITIONS DISMISSED.

BRUCE, J F, Piccadilly High Court Pet June 16 Ord July 14 Resc & Dis Sept 22
SEYMOUR, The Rt Hon Lord GEORGE, Stepney High Court Pet July 11 Ord July 31 Resc & Dis Sept 25

RECEIVING ORDER RESCINDED.

PEACOCK, G, Westbourne cres High Court Ord Sept 10 Resc Sept 22

FIRST MEETINGS.

BALE, THOMAS BROOK, Pontycymermer, Glam, Grocer Oct 13 at 9 117, Saint Mary st, Cardiff
BERRY, MATTHEW, Middleton, Norfolk, Farmer Oct 11 at 12 Off Rec, & King st, Norwich
BOWE, JOSEPH, Wood, Kendal, Farmer Oct 15 at 11.15 Commercial Hotel, Highgate, Kendal
BRADLEY, GEORGE, Norton on Tees, Durham, Stone Merchant Oct 11 at 11.30 Off Rec, Court chmbrs, Albert rd, Middlesbrough
BRANDENBURG, FREDERICK ADOLPH, Newcastle upon Tyne, Wholesale Provision Merchant Oct 14 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
BROOKES, ALFRED JOHN, Fulham rd, Cycle Dealer Oct 14 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
DANIEL, H A HOOD, Union ct, Old Broad st Oct 13 at 1 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
DAVIES, EDWARD, Loug or, Glam, Builder Oct 14 at 11.30 Off Rec, & Queen st, Carmarthen
GRIBBY, WALTER, Lambourne, Berks, Trainer of Racehorses Oct 13 at 12 1, St Aldate's, Oxford
HINDMARSH, THOMAS, Newcastle upon Tyne Oct 15 at 2.30 Off Rec, & Manor pl, Sunderland
ISAAC, DAVID, Pontycymermer, Glam, Builder Oct 13 at 12 117, St Mary st, Cardiff
ISAACSON, ISAAC, and MORRIS ISAACSON, Brunswick pl, City rd, Trunk Manufacturers Oct 13 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
LATHAM, FRED, Northwich, Cheshire, Butcher Oct 11 at 12 Off Rec, King st, Newcastle, Staffs
LEE, CHARLES WILLIAM, Westcliff, Essex Oct 13 at 12 14, Bedford row
MCGREGOR, DONALD, and ROBERT EDWARD MCGREGOR, Tottenham Court rd, Boot and Shoe Retailer Oct 14 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
NEWTON, WILLIAM ALFRED, Saffron Walden, Essex, Scotch Draper Oct 15 at 3 Rose and Crown Hotel, Saffron Walden
ODDY, BENJAMIN JOSEPH, Bradford, Taxi-cab Proprietor Oct 11 at 11 Off Rec, 12, Duke st, Bradford
FIDGON, WALTER, Walsoken, Norfolk, Butcher Oct 11 at 12.30 Off Rec, & King st, Norwich
RADFORD, FRANK, Sheffield, Pawnbroker Oct 15 at 12 Off Rec, Figgins ln, Sheffield
ROUND, EMMA, Retherton, Worcester Oct 13 at 12 Off Rec, 1, Priory st, Dudley
SARFIELD, JOHN, Accrington, Fish Salesman Oct 14 at 11.30 Off Rec, Court chmbrs, Albert rd, Middlesbrough
SIMPSON, ARTHUR DEWYN, Great Grimsby, Fish Merchant Oct 11 at 11 Off Rec, St Mary's chmbrs, Great Grimsby
SHEDLEY, FREDERICK WILLIAM, Nottingham, Lace Dealer Oct 14 at 11 Off Rec, 4, Castle pl, Park st, Nottingham
WALLIS, JOHN WILLIAM, Northallerton, Insurance Canvasser Oct 14 at 12 Off Rec, Court chmbrs, Albert rd, Middlesbrough
WEINBAUM, ISAAC MYER, 19, New Union st, Moorfields, Soft Goods Merchant Oct 15 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
WHEAT, HARRY WILLIAM, Hfrcombe, Devonshire Royal Clarence Hotel, Hfrcombe, Devonshire
WHITE, HAROLD GOODENOUGH and E W WHITE, Sketty, Swansea, Builders Oct 11 at 11 Off Rec, Government bldgs, St Mary st, Swansea

ADJUDICATIONS.

BRADSHAW, EDWIN, Clifton, Bristol, Asphalt Manufacturer Bristol Pet Aug 27 Ord Sept 30
BROOKES, ALFRED JOHN, Fulham rd, Cycle Dealer High Court Pet Sept 29 Ord Sept 30

CHADWICK, MICHAEL, Tring, Stationer Aylesbury Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 26
CROOK, TOM EVL, Hungerford, Licensed Victualler Newbury Pet Sept 30 Ord Sept 30
DAVIES, EDWARD, Loug or, Glam, Builder Carmarthen Pet Sept 29 Ord Sept 29
DIGGERS, L, New Cross rd, Grocer High Court Pet Aug 14 Ord Sept 27
ELLIOTT, JOHN HENRY, Harpenden, Herts St Albans Pet Aug 30 Ord Oct 1
FORD, JOSEPH JAMES, His Majesty's Prison, Derby, Auctioneer Stockport Pet Sept 29 Ord Sept 29
GROOM, WILLIAM, Whitlington, nr Oswestry, Under Gamekeeper Wrexham and Liangollen Pet Sept 30 Ord Sept 30
HALFORD, JOHN MORTAGUE, Cleveland gdns, Raywater High Court Pet Aug 1 Ord Oct 2
ISAACSON, ISAAC, and MORRIS ISAACSON, Brunswick pl, City rd, Trunk Manufacturers High Court Pet Oct 1 Ord Oct 1
LATHAM, FRED, Northwich, Cheshire, Butcher Nantwich Pet Sept 29 Ord Sept 29
LEES, JAMES, Higher Broughton, Salford, Ashbin Manufacturer Salford Pet July 1 Ord Sept 30
LEFROY, F B, Lancaster gate, Hyde park High Court Pet July 17 Ord Oct 1
LOPRESTI, EVELYN, Chichester, Sussex Brighton Pet Sept 2 Ord Oct 1
ODDY, BENJAMIN JOSEPH, Bradford, Taxi Cab Proprietor Bradford Pet Oct 1 Ord Oct 1
PETTIT, ARTHUR TRUSTRAM, Lxworth, Suffolk, Baker Bury St Edmunds Pet Aug 21 Ord Sept 30
READ, JAMES, Norwich, Fruit Merchant Norwich Pet Oct 1 Ord Oct 1
RUSHBY, ALFRED EDWARD, Great Grimsby, Tobaccoists' Traveller Great Grimsby Pet Oct 1 Ord Oct 1
SEYMOUR, CLAUDE OSMAN, Winscombe, Somerset, Coal Merchant Wells Pet Oct 1 Ord Oct 1
SIMPSON, ARTHUR DEWYN, Great Grimsby, Fish Merchant Great Grimsby Pet Sept 29 Ord Sept 29
SMITH, MOSS, Great Prescott st, Cloth ng Manufacturer High Court Pet Sept 3 Ord Sept 30
THOMAS, HUGH JOHN, Trefriw, Carnarvonshire, Miner Portmadoc Pet Sept 30 Ord Sept 30
WADE, WILLIAM HENRY, Netherfield, Notts, Grocer Nottingham Pet Oct 1 Ord Oct 1
WALLIS, JOHN WILLIAM, Northallerton, Insurance Canvasser Oct 14 at 12 Off Rec, Court chmbrs, Albert rd, Middlesbrough
WEINBAUM, ISAAC MYER, Union st, Moorfields, Soft Goods Merchant High Court Pet Sept 29 Ord Oct 1
WILLET, GEORGE HAGGER, Saffron Walden, Essex, Butcher Cambridge Pet Sept 17 Ord Oct 1

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Oct. 7.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

ARMITAGE, WILLIAM HERBERT, Bradford, Rag Merchant Bradford Pet Oct 3 Ord Oct 3
BAGULEY, CHARLES HENRY, Sheffield, Compositor Sheffield Pet Oct 4 Ord Oct 4
BARNES, JOHN PALMER, Gainsborough, Lincs, Draper Lincoln Pet Oct 3 Ord Oct 3
CATTIE, GEORGE DANIEL, Ebbw Vale, Mon, Fishmonger Tredegar Pet Oct 3 Ord Oct 3
COCKRAN, ROBERT WILLIAM, Talgarth, Brecknock Farmer Hereford Pet Oct 4 Ord Oct 4
DAVIES, DAVID JOSEPH HENRY, Llantrindod Wells Tailor Newtown Pet Oct 3 Ord Oct 3
DAVIES, WILLIAM HENRY, Aberystwyth, Machine Dealer Tredegar Pet Sept 17 Ord Oct 2
EDWARDS, THOMAS, Lincoln, Draper Lincoln Pet Oct 2 Ord Oct 2
FOSTER, JAMES Nafferton, York, Portable Building Maker Kingston upon Hull Pet Oct 4 Ord Oct 4
JARDINE, E R, Leopold st, Bardett rd, Credit Draper High Court Pet Sept 17 Ord Oct 3
KERSHAW, HENRY, Fartown, Huddersfield, Wagon Builder Huddersfield Pet Oct 4 Ord Oct 4
KITCHEN, WILLIAM, Lincoln, Cycle Dealer Lincoln Pet Oct 3 Ord Oct 3
NICHOLS, EDWARD, Southamption Pet Oct 3 Ord Oct 3
PEPLOW, RUPERT, Shrewsbury, Baker Shrewsbury Pet Sept 22 Ord Oct 2
ROBERTS, GEORGE WILLIAM, Ludlow, Salop, Veterinary Surgeon Leominster Pet Sept 29 Ord Oct 2
SHENNAN, JOHN SHEARER, Higher Openshaw, Manchester Credit Draper Manchester Pet Oct 3 Ord Oct 2
SHEARMAN, GEORGE C, Haymark t High Court Pet June 4 Ord Oct 2
SIMP, GEORGE VERNON, Broad st bldgs, Company Promoter High Court Pet June 27 Ord Oct 2
SMITH, CHARLES, Toddingdon, Beds, Baker Luton Pet Oct 3 Ord Oct 3
SWIFT, JOHN SQUIRE, Leeds, Bookkeeper Leeds Pet Oct 3 Ord Oct 1
TRENTHAM, GEORGE, Farranwell Station, Cornwall, Farmer Truro Pet Oct 4 Ord Oct 4
WELLS, CHARLES, Pensance, Motor Repairer Truro Pet Oct 4 Ord Oct 4
WILLIAMS, DAVID JONES, Blaenau, Festiniog, Insurance Agent Portmadoc Pet Oct 2 Ord Oct 2

RECEIVING ORDER RESCINDED.

ASHWORTH, STANLEY WATSON, Kingston on Thames, Surrey Kingston, Surrey Rec Ord July 10 Resc Sept 23

204th Year of the Office.

The Oldest Insurance Office in the World



Copyright Policy and 1885

SUN FIRE OFFICE
FOUNDED 1710.
HEAD OFFICE:
63, THREADNEEDLE ST., E.C.
Insurances effected on the following risks:—
FIRE DAMAGE.
RESULTANT LOSS OF RENT AND PROFITS.
EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY and PERSONAL ACCIDENT.
WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION, and SICKNESS AND DISEASE.
including ACCIDENTS TO DOMESTIC SERVANTS. BURGLARY.
PLATE GLASS.

FIDELITY GUARANTEE.

Law Courts Branch: 40, CHANCERY LANE, W.C.

A. W. COUSINS, District Manager.

=

on

,

&

et

w.

en

ug

na

y,

er

3j

er

pl,

ut

ch

u.

rt

et

or

er

et

ta'

pal

nt

car

er

er

Pet

oft

rd

ox,

nt

or

per

or

ck

lla

ler

t 2

ker

igh

lee

Pet

cer

Pet

ary

er

Pet

ter

Pet

Oct

Var-

Pet

ncc

sur

040